FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-065
Wednesday
7 April 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-065 — CONTENTS — *7 April 1993*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Agenda in Former Soviet Central Asia Pondered *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Apr]* 1

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

- Azerbaijan Envoy in Moscow Comments on Fighting *[Moscow Radio]* 2
- Shaposhnikov Offers To Mediate in Karabakh Conflict *[ITAR-TASS]* 2
  - Comments on Achieving Peace *[ITAR-TASS]* 2
- Shaposhnikov Calls For CIS Security Council *[Moscow TV]* 3
- Russia Implementing Withdrawal From CIS, Baltics *[INTERFAX]* 3
- CIS Representatives Discuss Information Exchange *[Minsk Radio]* 3
- Lack of Technology Hinders Bank Payments *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
- ITAR-TASS Carries Press Reviews for Moscow Papers 4
  - 6 Apr 'Evening Newspapers' 4
  - Press Review for 7 Apr 5

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Officials Comment on Results of Vancouver Summit 7
  - Kozyrev on Links to START *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 6 Apr]* 7
  - Shokhin on 'Partnership' With U.S. *[INTERFAX]* 7
  - More Kozyrev, Shokhin Remarks *[Vladivostok Radio]* 8
  - Deputies' Reaction *[INTERFAX]* 9
  - Opposition Member Cited *[INTERFAX]* 9
- Media Continue Assessment of Vancouver Summit 10
  - Yeltsin-Clinton Doctrine Examined *[Radio Rossii]* 10
  - U.S. Support 'Far Exceeded' Expectations *[SEGODNYA 6 Apr]* 10
  - Need To Sell Package to Domestic Audiences *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 6 Apr]* 11
  - Summit's Effectiveness Questioned *[FEDERATSIYA 6 Apr]* 12
  - Russian Disarmament 'Crux' of Package *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 13
  - Aid Not Conducive to Good Economy *[SEGODNYA 6 Apr]* 13
  - Aid Package Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 14
- Yeltsin Meets U.S. Congressional Delegation in Kremlin *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
  - Comments on Referendum *[ITAR-TASS]* 15
  - Praises Clinton's Support *[INTERFAX]* 15
- Joint Testing of 'Plasma Weapon' Proposed With U.S. *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 15
  - Project Leader Comments *[Moscow TV]* 16
- Official: U.S. Grain Aid To Be Sold Through Exchanges *[INTERFAX]* 17
- West's Support for Yeltsin Seen as 'Mistake' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Apr]* 17
- Kozyrev To Visit Japan Before G-7 Meeting *[INTERFAX]* 19
- Foreign Minister Kozyrev Pays Visit to Pakistan 19
  - Seeks 'Good Neighborly Belt' *[INTERFAX]* 19
  - To Initial Document *[ITAR-TASS]* 20
  - Arrives in Islamabad *[ITAR-TASS]* 20
- Foreign Ministry's Yastrzhembskiy Briefs Journalists 20
  - Kozyrev Message on CIS Armed Conflicts *[Moscow Radio]* 20
  - Dialogue With Turkey on Karabakh *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Concern Over UN Staff's Security *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Yugoslav Situation Discussed *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Russian Plane Shot at in Angola *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
- Talks Begin With Georgian Delegation in Sochi *[Moscow Radio]* 22
  - Grachev Details Moscow's Position *[INTERFAX]* 22

Grachev on 'Dismembering' Georgia *[INTERFAX]* 23
Government To Demand Russian Troop Withdrawal *[INTERFAX]* 23
Cease-Fire in Place *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Grachev Comments on First Session *[ITAR-TASS]* 24
Grachev May Meet Shevardnadze in Tbilisi 9 Apr *[Tbilisi Radio]* 24
No Agreement Yet *[Russian TV]* 25
Grachev: Russian Troops To Stay Until 1995 *[ITAR-TASS]* 25
Official Explains Use of Black Sea Ships for Abkhazia Evacuation *[INTERFAX]* 25
News Briefing Held on Ukrainian Nuclear Weapons *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* 26
Neglected Nuclear Weapons in Ukraine Pose Danger *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 26
Ukrainian Claims on Black Sea Fleet Repudiated *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Apr]* 27
Defense Ministry Denies Role in Armenian-Azerbaijani Fighting *[INTERFAX]* 28
Churkin Flies to Belgrade for Bosnia-Herzegovina Talks *[INTERFAX]* 28
NATO Action on Bosnia Condemned; Grachev Role Questioned *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 28
Grachev Remarks on Baltic Pullout Said 'Own View' *[SEGODNYA 6 Apr]* 29
Shokhin Says Paris Club's Debt Rescheduling Helps Reforms *[ITAR-TASS]* 29
Expects Agreement With IMF *[INTERFAX]* 29
Sees 'Breathing Space' *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 6 Apr]* 30
Russian, PRC Admirals See Prospects for Ties *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
South African Ambassador Discusses Progress of Reforms *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 31
Qatari Foreign Minister Meets Deputy Foreign Minister *[ITAR-TASS]* 32
Defense Official Meets UAE Defense Minister *[ITAR-TASS]* 32

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political Issues

Russia 'Will Never Start' New Round of Nuclear Tests *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Rutskoy Criticizes Yeltsin for 'Going Begging' *[London TV]* 33
Shumeyko Dismisses Rumors of 'Imminent Cabinet Reshuffle' *[INTERFAX]* 33
Ministers' Presidium Meets, Chaired by Chernomyrdin *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
Urgent Business Measures Approved *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
First Deputy Minister of Fuel, Energy To 'Transfer' *[INTERFAX]* 33
Further on 6 Apr Roundtable in Moscow 34
Meetings May Bring 'Accord' *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Rutskoy on 'Leakage of Funds' *[INTERFAX]* 34
Further Rutskoy Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 34
Proceedings Summarized *[ITAR-TASS]* 34
Deputies Say Survival 'Not Possible' With Yeltsin *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 35
Pro-Yeltsin Group Urges Support of President *[ITAR-TASS]* 36
Democratic Party's Travkin Calls For Pre-Term Elections *[ITAR-TASS]* 37
Civic Union Leader Ponders Congress Results *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 3 Apr]* 37
Court Justice Comments on Yeltsin's Actions *[PRAVDA 3 Apr]* 39
Constitutional Court's Work Viewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Apr]* 41
New Law on State Border Analyzed; Flaws Seen *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Apr]* 42

Referendum Issues

Further Shumeyko Comment on Referendum Questions *[INTERFAX]* 43
Referendum 'Opinion Poll' Remains 'A Possibility' *[INTERFAX]* 44
Presidential Referendum Strategy Explained *[SEGODNYA 6 Apr]* 44
Statistical Analysis of Referendum Scenarios *[SEGODNYA 6 Apr]* 45
Court Judge Says Referendum Will Favor Yeltsin *[ITAR-TASS]* 46
Poll Shows Gains for Yeltsin in Cities, Forces *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 47
Arrangements for Soldiers To Vote in Referendum Explained *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Apr]* 47

Media Issues

'Uncensored' Congress Media Decree Published *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 48
Yeltsin Edict on Ostankino TV Stabilization Guarantees *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 3 Apr]* 49

- ITAR-TASS Labor Collective Supports Ignatenko *[ITAR-TASS]* 50
- Minister Calls For Journalistic Professionalism *[ITAR-TASS]* 50

Economic Issues

- Gerashchenko Not To Resign Unless Supreme Soviet Agrees *[Russian TV]* 51
- Implications of Doubling Minimum Wage Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 51
  - Raise Seen as Pre-Referendum 'Populism' *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 51
- Gasoline Prices in Moscow To Double 7 Apr *[BALTFAX]* 52
- Gold Stock 'Replenished,' Totals 308 Tonnes *[ITAR-TASS]* 52
- Article Views Cabinet's Economic Record *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 3 Apr]* 52
- Former Minister Andrey Nechayev Interviewed *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 6 Apr]* 53

Supreme Soviet

- Chairman Khasbulatov on Conflict With Yeltsin *[Lisbon EXPRESSO 3 Apr]* 54
- Plan for 'Protection Department' Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 56
- New Arm Created To Expand Influence on Regions *[KOMMERSANT-DAILY 6 Apr]* 57
- Faction Calls For Public To Back Yeltsin *[ITAR-TASS]* 57

Regional Affairs

- Blast Causes 'Radioactive Contamination' in Tomsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
  - Assessed as '3d Level' Accident *[INTERFAX]* 58
  - Contamination Levels Reported *[ITAR-TASS]* 58
  - Journalists Allowed Access *[Radio Rossii]* 58
  - 'Contradictory' Reports on Radiation *[INTERFAX]* 59
  - 'No Need To Evacuate' *[Russian TV]* 59
  - 'Most Serious Incident' Since Chernobyl *[ITAR-TASS]* 59
  - Emergency Committee Dispatches Team *[INTERFAX]* 59
  - Emergency Team Continues Work *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
  - Village Affected; 'Cloud' Spreading *[Moscow TV]* 60
  - Contamination Extends Beyond Tomsk *[ITAR-TASS]* 60
  - Scale of Accident Debated *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 61
- Yeltsin Protests Abolishment of Mordovian Presidency *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
- Chechnya 'Disregarding' Referendum; To Hold Own Poll *[ITAR-TASS]* 62
- Troops Reportedly Pulling Out of Ingushetia *[Moscow Radio]* 63
  - Troops 'Almost Fully Withdrawn' *[INTERFAX]* 63
- President Appoints Russian General Vice President *[ITAR-TASS]* 63
- Aushev Accuses Ossetia of Delaying Refugee Return *[INTERFAX]* 63
- Troop Exercises Continue in North Caucasian Region *[ITAR-TASS]* 64
- Referendum Preparations in Moscow; Tambov Supports Yeltsin *[Moscow TV]* 64
- St. Petersburg Residents To Be Polled on City's Status *[IZVESTIYA 3 Apr]* 64
  - Procurator Challenges Legality *[St. Petersburg Radio]* 64
- Yeltsin Receives Highest Rating in Tatarstan Poll *[Moscow Radio]* 64
- Referendum Headquarters Set Up in Tatarstan *[INTERFAX]* 65
- New Organization Set Up in North Caucasus *[INTERFAX]* 65
- Cossack Congress Ends; Volga Cossack Corps Reformed *[ITAR-TASS]* 65

UKRAINE

International Affairs

- Government Presents Stance on Nuclear Weapons *[Kiev International]* 66
  - Reconfirms Right to 'Nuclear Components' *[INTERFAX]* 66
  - To Observe Minsk, Alma-Ata Accords *[UKRINFORM]* 67
- Ministries Respond to Grachev's Call To 'Pressure' Ukraine *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 2 Apr]* 67
- Kravchuk Meets U.S. Congressmen, Views Talks With Russia *[UKRINFORM]* 68
- Kuchma Urges U.S. To Remember Ukraine *[INTERFAX]* 68
- Official Calls For Early Nuclear Arms Accord Ratification *[INTERFAX]* 68

National Affairs

Kravchuk Explains Views on Events in Russia *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 1 Apr]* 69
Kravchuk Confirms Need for Tanker Fleet *[Kiev International]* 71
Government Reviews Draft Budget *[Moscow Radio]* 71
  Further on Deficit *[INTERFAX]* 72
Preparations Under Way To Stop Chernobyl Power Station *[Kiev International]* 72
Deputy Premier Says Closing of Chernobyl 'Inexpedient' *[Moscow International]* 72
18 'Incidents' Occur at Nuclear Power Stations in Mar *[HOLOS UKRAYINY 2 Apr]* 72

WESTERN REGION

Belarus

Shushkevich Says Executive Branch 'Imperfect' *[INTERFAX]* 74
UK, Russia, U.S. Offer Security Assurances on NPT *[Minsk Radio]* 74
Shushkevich on Economic, Military Union, Presidency *[RID]* 74
Kozlovskiy Addresses Supreme Soviet on Army *[VO SLAVU RODINY 27 Mar]* 74
Official Describes American Oil Investments *[NARODNAYA GAZETA 16 Mar]* 76

CENTRAL ASIA

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Decree on Establishing Languages Committee *[KAZTAG]* 78
Nazarbayev To Lead World Fund To Rescue Aral Sea *[Moscow International]* 78

Tajikistan

Search Continues for 'Captured' Russian Border Guards *[INTERFAX]* 78
  Russian Commander Investigates Abduction *[INTERFAX]* 78
Russians Continue To Leave Tajikistan *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 6 Apr]* 79

Turkmenistan

Commentary Stresses Importance of President's Trip to U.S. *[Ashgabat Radio]* 79
Niyazov Criticizes Cabinet Officials, Deputy Ministers *[INTERFAX]* 79

CAUCASUS

Armenia

Presidiums Issue Appeal to People *[Yerevan Radio]* 80
Karabakh Commander Says No Russians Fighting in Karabakh *[Yerevan International]* 80
First Deputy Foreign Minister Comments on Karabakh *[ITAR-TASS]* 80
Spokesman Berates Baku for Damaging Bridges, Pipelines *[INTERFAX]* 80

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Says Kelbadzhar Fall 'Serious Blow at Democracy' *[INTERFAX]* 81
  Seeks Egyptian Leadership's Help *[Baku Radio]* 81
Turkish Leader Telegrams Elchibey on 'Armenian Aggression' *[AZERTAC]* 81
Defense Ministry Reports Armenian Assault on Kubatly *[INTERFAX]* 81
  Armenian Forces Attacking Fizuli *[AZERTAC]* 82
  Fizuli Attacks Repulsed *[TURAN]* 82
  Kelbadzhar Area Situation Still 'Complex' *[INTERFAX]* 82
Parliament Holds Closed Session on Situation *[AZERTAC]* 82
Foreign Minister Said To Cancel Geneva Cease-Fire Talks *[AFP]* 83
Baku Reports Situation in Fizuli 'Improved' *[Baku Radio]* 83
Minister Says Country May Seek Military Help Abroad *[London TV]* 83
Baku Asks Iran To Help Evacuate Civilians *[ITAR-TASS]* 83

Army Launches Counteroffensive in Karabakh *[ITAR-TASS]* 83

Georgia

Shevardnadze Views U.S. Statement on Abkhazia *[CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]* 84
Shevardnadze Evaluates Russia-U.S. Summit *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Parliament Defeats Bill Demanding Russian Army Withdrawal *[ITAR-TASS]* 84
Abkhazia Ready for Peace if Georgians Withdrawal *[INTERFAX]* 84

BALTIC STATES

Estonia

Meri Views Russian Troop Pullout, Vancouver Summit *[BALTFAX]* 86
    Denies Rights Violations *[Tallinn Radio]* 86
Summit With Russia To Be Proposed at Talks *[BALTFAX]* 86
    Russian Delegate 'Threatened' To End Talks *[ETA NEWS RELEASE]* 87
Russian Delegate Gives Data on Number of Servicemen *[BALTFAX]* 87
Prime Minister on Future Uses of Paldiski Naval Base *[BALTFAX]* 87
Retired U.S. Colonel Seeking Command of Estonian Army *[BALTFAX]* 87
Agreement Reached With Latvia on Border Changes *[BNS]* 87

Lithuania

Gylys Notes Support for Stabilization in Russia *[BALTFAX]* 88
Brazauskas Receives Message From Russia's Kozyrev *[Vilnius Radio]* 88
Prime Minister Discusses Program at Seimas *[Vilnius Radio]* 88
Army Officers Establish Assembly *[BALTFAX]* 89
Brazauskas Attends Meeting Commemorating Trade Unions *[Vilnius Radio]* 89
    Further Brazauskas Remarks *[BALTFAX]* 90
Landsbergis Marks Anniversary of Independence *[LIETUVOS AIDAS 12 Mar]* 90

Agenda in Former Soviet Central Asia Pondered

PM0704102793 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Apr 93 Single Edition p 7

[Vladimir Berezovskiy report: "Will Turkestan Move Toward the Bosporus Beacon?"]

[Excerpts] Tashkent—Visits by high-ranking figures from Turkey to the Central Asian republics are following virtually one upon the other. And around two weeks ago, Army General Dogan Gures, chief of the general staff, was received by the presidents of Turkestan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan, which confirms once again that Ankara is persistently trying to consolidate its position in Turkestan. Why does it need to do this, and what are the young states—the former Soviet "sunshine states"—counting on? [passage omitted]

Turkey was the first, without losing a day, to recognize the independence of the Central Asian republics, and opened its embassies directly after the United States. There was an immediate flood of businessmen, journalists, and government delegations. Without delay Ankara flung open the armored doors of its safes, issuing credits to purchase grain and sugar, and puts planes carrying humanitarian aid into the air.

The rapid rapprochement of Turkey and the Central Asian republics, however, was dictated by several factors. Ankara has not concealed that it is pursuing more political goals. In increasing its influence in this region, it grows also in the eyes of its main NATO partners. It is clear that behind Turkey's back stands the United States, where, evidently, they reasoned soundly that it would be easier for the "Turkish brothers" to build bridges and entrench themselves in Turkestan.

As for Central Asia, in the first place it hoped that the Turkish locomotive will drag its economy out of crisis, help the formation of vitally important sectors, and stave off the threat of mass unemployment. Whose balance sheet shows positive gains? I think that so far Turkey is in the black, its political weight in international affairs having grown appreciably. To such an extent, moreover, that President Turgut Ozal has begun talking of a "new Muslim state" in which 160 million Turks will live.

It should be understood that Central Asia has already been shortchanged here. The gains of the postcommunist East are far more modest. A cotton processing factory in Nukus, a German bank bought by Kazakhstan on an equal footing with the Turkish president's son Ahmed, the production of leather jackets in Kokand, several dozen joint ventures of little account—and that, perhaps, is all.

In point of fact, such a turn of events is predictable. Turkey, of course, has made an economic surge forward in the last 15 years. But not so powerful as to take anyone else in tow.

It has become clear that the credits allocated to the Central Asian republics are more of a political gesture. Turkey, in point of fact, has itself admitted this. [Turkish Prime Minister] Suleyman Demirel recently called on the European Community to invest capital more energetically in the economy of the former Soviet East and secured an accord with Saudi Arabia to set up a special bank for these purposes. The only way Turkey itself can help is by flooding Central Asia with consumer goods. But this means to bury the local light industry with all the ensuing consequences.

In my view, the hullabaloo around Turkey died down of its own accord when the diplomatic veil of fulsome statements was dispersed. Serious analysts understand that what saved the economy of the former "sunshine states" from complete collapse was Russia's multibillion credits, their presence in the ruble zone, and the fact that Moscow assumed the external debts of the young states. However, the leaders of these republics, who firmly held on to the helm of government, must also be given their due.

The time has probably come to make a more sober assessemt of the course which Ankara is carrying out. What, for example, does the Turkish model, so persistently propagandized by the West and the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs as a panacea for Muslim states, really entail? An economy geared toward exports, the "severance" of Islam from the state, entry into the world market—that is obvious. But what about the many years of cruel repression of the Kurds, the mass murders of journalists, the nationalism that merges into Pan-Turkism, and the Turkish gunmen in Bosnia?

The Central Asian press has kept a diplomatic silence, but it is a fact that during last year's visit Demirel brought with him the well-known fascist Colonel Turkes, who publicly raves about a Turkey from the Adriatic to Mongolia. The question arises: What was the father of the "grey wolves" looking for in Tashkent, Ashgabat, and Bishkek?

The course of history has, it would appear, "pushed away" Turkestan from the USSR's granite "harbor" and drawn in into the open sea of big politics. But this, I suggest, does not mean that Russia can calmly watch other beacons shine on its old and loyal partners.

Azerbaijan Envoy in Moscow Comments on Fighting

LD0604172993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by correspondent Stanislav Blazhenkov on a 6 April news conference at the Azerbaijan Republic's mission in Moscow; passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] [Blazhenkov] Addressing the news conference, Hikmet Gadzhizade, deputy prime minister and Azerbaijan's plenipotentiary representative in Moscow, evaluated the situation in Azerbaijan and the new stage in the Karabakh conflict.

[Gadzhizade] "Azerbaijan is experiencing difficult times at the moment. Armenia's Armed Forces, supported by units of Russia's 7th Army, have launched a two-pronged attack from Armenia and a single-pronged attack from Nagorno-Karabakh on Azerbaijan, seizing over 1,000 square km of Azerbaijani territory that is not part of Karabakh.

"At the present time, fighting is continuing both in the south and in the north. All this is happening outside Karabakh. A large number of civilians are surrounded. Hundreds of them have been killed. They are being shot at point-blank range. Others have suffered frostbite while trying to escape the encirclement. This is unconcealed aggression by the Republic of Armenia against Azerbaijan.

"As you know, talks on a settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict have begun under CSCE auspices. Azerbaijan is actively participating in this process, which is difficult and protracted. The first encouraging steps have been taken, however. Agreement was reached about a month ago between our Foreign Minister Tofik Kasumov and an Armenian delegation."

[Blazhenkov] The CSCE plan, supported by Azerbaijan, envisaged a cease-fire, withdrawal of all forces from the conflict zone, and talks between Azerbaijan and Armenia, on the one hand, and between Azerbaijan and representatives of Nagorno-Karabakh, on the other.

[Gadzhizade] "That was the CSCE plan, and we complied with it unswervingly. On 25 March, our minister traveled to Geneva to negotiate a cease-fire and to adopt a document described as a timetable for the withdrawal of forces; however, the offensive began on 27 March.

"What is the purpose of this offensive? It is obvious. They want to seize as much territory as possible, and then negotiate with Azerbaijan from a position of strength. Three days after the offensive, the leaders of the Nagorno-Karabakh movement suddenly announced in the central media that they had, allegedly, issued some kind of appeal to the Azerbaijani Parliament calling for talks . That was after the fighting had already begun in Kelbadzhar. Talks are in progress anyway. A difficult negotiating process is under way.

"On behalf of the Azerbaijani Government, I can state quite authoritatively that nobody can negotiate with Azerbaijan from a position of strength. The Armenian task force must be withdrawn from Azerbaijan."

[Blazhenkov] Answering a question about the involvement of the Russian Army in the hostilities, Gadzhizade said:

[Gadzhizade] "We do not doubt that units of Russia's 7th Army are taking part in the operation. We have a large number of radio intercepts and other evidence that we have presented to the Russian ambassador. Who gave them the order? That is the question. We have no documents on that score. We do not know whether their orders came from the Kremlin, from the General Staff, or from the army leadership—or whether they just slipped out of their barracks and started taking part in the conflict on that side as mercenaries."

Shaposhnikov Offers To Mediate in Karabakh Conflict

LD0604132093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1255 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, has sent letters to the presidents of Azerbaijan and Armenia in which he offers to act as a mediator in the conflict between those two countries. Interviewed by Radio "Ekho Moskvy" today, Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov said it would be useful if representatives of the Defense Ministries of Armenia and Azerbaijan, as well as the Karabakh side, were to meet as a matter of urgency. Such a meeting, the commander in chief believes, could be held in, for example, Rostov-on-Don or Stavropol.

Comments on Achieving Peace

LD0604165793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1434 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow, 6 April—"Seeing the pernicious nature of the war in the Transcaucasus and striving to settle the conflict around Nagorno-Karabakh as soon as possible, last week I offered my services as mediator to the presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan," Marshal of Aviation Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent today. He noted that the difficulty of solving this issue lies in the fact that Armenia is a member of the CIS and the collective security treaty, whereas Azerbaijan is not.

Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov also said that the High Command of the CIS Joint Armed Forces "is prepared to take upon itself a mediatory role not along a political line but along a military line, at the level of both republics' defense departments." A cease-fire should become the first step in this direction, Shaposhnikov believes. "Subsequently," he went on, "the High Command is ready to send its observers to both sides' military formations; the observers are to establish reciprocal information exchange; restrain, by their presence, the opposite sides from waging hostilities; and, in the future, separate the sides by a corridor of predetermined width. Specific political steps should be simultaneously undertaken."

Marshal Shaposhnikov regards as useful "the holding of an urgent meeting in south Russia of representatives of the military departments of Armenia and Azerbaijan," with the Karabakh side itself taking part.

The CIS commander said that he has received a reply from Azerbaijan Defense Minister Dadash Rzayev, who thanked him for the mediation proposal and remarked that he hopes for settlement along the CSCE line. "There has been no reply so far from Armenia's military department," Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov added.

Shaposhnikov Calls For CIS Security Council

LD0504130193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By correspondent Sergey Omelchenko; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commnander in chief of the CIS Joint Armed Forces, today called for the establishment of a Security Council to which Commonwealth heads of state and government would belong. This body would be responsible for the overall leadership of national armies which make up the CIS Joint Armed Forces.

Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov made this declaration at a theoretical and practical conference in Moscow on "legal and social security for servicemen, as a factor making for military-political stability in the Commonwealth."

[Omelchenko] Neither joint nor national armed forces can be effectively developed without a smooth integrated system of equitable relations between states. This is the conclusion being drawn at today's conference in Moscow by specialists of the Main Command of the CIS Joint Armed Forces. The military believe that the time has come to wake up from boundless sovereignty—which nobody is infringing anyway—and to start setting up a single legal space. One of the first steps toward this could be identical, or at least agreed, principles for legal and social protection of servicemen in CIS countries.

[Shaposhnikov] Our peoples and our army should have benefitted from the establishment of the Commonwealth. They should be able to resolve all problems. Life should be better. Service life should be easier. Relations should be more humane, but experience shows that, in general, this is not happening. Some leaders like to make drastic statements. Others make frivolous promises. Others are set on victory in various hotspots.

[Omelchenko] Yes, social and legal problems in the Armed Forces are being exacerbated by the political and economic situation in the Commonwealth countries. But military specialists believe, all the same, that there are real prospects for resolving them. The package of documents on legal and social protection of servicemen, drawn up at this conference, will be presented at the end of the month to the Interparliamentary Assembly and then at the next meeting of the CIS heads of state and government in Yerevan.

Russia Implementing Withdrawal From CIS, Baltics

OW0604204593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1927 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The creation of sovereign states on the territory of the former USSR has caused the situation where a substantial part of the Russian forces and military equipment have remained outside Russia; a fact which sometimes the press and representatives of several countries tendentiously interpret. To this effect the Russian Foreign Ministry declared on Tuesday [6 April] that Moscow advocates settling these issues along civilized lines, by means of consultations and negotiations.

Basing on the principles of the law, Russia, the Foreign Ministry's statement cites, is successively implementing withdrawal of the Russian forces from the Baltics, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Moldova, and negotiating the issue on their status with those states where they will stay on mutual agreement. Russia has already signed bilateral agreements on the legal status of the Russian forces with Armenia and Turkmenistan.

Russia's Foreign Ministry notes that taking into consideration an interim staying of the Russian forces in the former Soviet republics, the Russian authorities believe that their final withdrawal cannot be implemented without a satisfactory solution of the issues concerning their accommodation in places of their new deployment, and creation of normal living conditions for servicemen and members of their families.

The Foreign Ministry's statement also points out that in some cases the Russian military personnel can participate in peace- keeping operations, in particular, during disengagement of warring parties, in supporting legal order, in guarding military sites, and in rendering humanitarian aid to population.

CIS Representatives Discuss Information Exchange

WS0704090193 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 0300 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Text] A conference of plenipotentiary representatives of CIS members has opened at the CIS Headquarters in Minsk. The conference is devoted to the issue of providing information and analytical data necessary for the implementation of multilateral agreements. Yevgeniy Orlov, head of the Russian State Committee for Cooperation, presented the main provisions of the draft resolution. The document under consideration envisions the development of the system of providing information and analytical data necessary for implementing both bilateral and multilateral agreements among CIS members on a single conceptual basis.

Lack of Technology Hinders Bank Payments

LD0604154693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1454 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Petrenko]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—It now takes one month or even more to settle accounts among CIS banks due to lacking modern technologies. This gravely complicates mutual settlements among partners and tends to boost prices.

Commenting on this situation, Vice-Chairman of the Russian Central Bank Vyacheslav Solovev said that the low paying capacity of Russian enterprises puts a brake on the transfer of Russian money to the banks of other CIS states in payment for the goods they sell to Russia. This increases their need for Russian credits in order to pay roubles for the goods supplied from our republic.

At present, Russia is granting rather substantial so-called technical credits to CIS nations. They totalled more than 1.5 trillion roubles over the past nine months. In spite of this, however, the problem of settling mutual debts remains acute.

It is important to accelerate settlements among CIS nations. How can this be done? According to Solovev, there is an idea to open accounts of major commercial banks in the Russian Central Bank's chief information centre. This end will be promoted also by the efforts of the interstate bank, an agreement on the formation of which was signed during the Minsk CIS summit last January. The first steps have already been made in this direction. The drafts of some documents have been forwarded to the Russian Supreme Soviet a short while ago. Plans are afoot to set up a special working team shortly to determine what technologies and equipment are needed to discharge the bank's functions, to pick the necessary experts and to resolve other problems.

The International Monetary Fund and the European Community Commission, as well as several national banks in some major Western countries have evinced interest in such an interstate bank. They have expressed readiness not only to help draw up methodological materials, but to provide the new financial institution with modern banking equipment and to train the needed personnel.

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Reviews for Moscow Papers

6 Apr 'Evening Newspapers'

LD0604192493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1830 GMT 6 Apr 93

["Moscow Evening Newspapers—Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A regular round of the Russian- Georgian negotiations in Sochi will focus on the Abkhazian conflict, the IZVESTIA newspaper reports today, saying the Georgian side categorically demands the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Russian troops from the conflict zone.

If the sides fail to agree on the issue, the negotiations may be broken, says the newspaper.

At the same time, the Russian stand at the negotiations is well- known and Russian troops will be withdrawn from Georgian territory in accordance with the intergovernmental agreement. As for participation of Russian troops in the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict, they remain neutral.

The number one Azeri problem is to deter the Armenian offensive and help tens of thousands of refugees, which found themselves in an extremely difficult situation.

"Russian citizens must control the all-Russian referendum," believes member of the Russian democratic organizations' public center Mikhail Shneider. Public committees in support of the referendum have been set up throughout Russia, he told IZVESTIA today. They will provide for public control at polling stations on the voting day.

IZVESTIA carries an article by Boris Vasilyev, saying the president's actions were prompted by his concern over the fate of Russia. The congress, in its turn, feared to lose personal comfort and a possibility to counteract democracy.

IZVESTIA carries the results of a public opinion poll held by the independent Institute of Parliamentarianism Sociology. The rating of President Boris Yeltsin, which increased from 36 per cent on March 11 to 53 per cent on March 25 on the eve of the Russian People's Deputies Congress, suddenly dropped to 49 per cent on April 1. The rating of his political opponent, Ruslan Khasbulatov, has considerably gone up since the congress: from six per cent on March 25 to ten per cent on April 1.

The number of Muscovites, favoring Boris Yeltsin in the conflict between the Russian legislative and executive authorities, decreased from 55 to 48 per cent, and the number of respondents, supporting the congress and the Supreme Soviet, increased from six to nine per cent.

Activities of the Nevada-Semei joint stock society heads, including poet Olzhas Suleymenov, have provoked a scandal in Kazakhstan. "Republican security revealed the storage of a large batch of cathode and pure copper, allegedly delivered in 1992 by the Balkhashmed Amalgamation to the Nevada-Semei joint stock society, at the polymer plant for further delivery abroad.

"There were no documents on the copper origin and its belonging to the society. Search of the society general director's apartment revealed a Kalashnikov rifle with ammunition, a foreign-made pistol with cartridges, over 1,000 cartridges for a makarov pistol and cold steel. A search at the society president's apartment removed a foreign-made pistol with cartridges and cartridges for a Makarov pistol. The general director was arrested by the procurator's office".

The Ukrainian-Russian relations have aggravated again because of the nuclear arms stationed on Ukrainian territory, IZVESTIA said. If Ukraine does not want to withdraw the warheads before the solution on their processing into nuclear fuel for Ukrainian nuclear power plants, it could pass over its bases and arsenals of nuclear- technical and missile-technical support to the Russian jurisdiction. Otherwise, it should openly declare its intention to remain a nuclear power, take on itself all legal and technical responsibility for nuclear safety of the arms and other international-legal consequences, says the newspaper.

The VECHERNAYA MOSKVA newspaper reports criminal groups from Caucasus are increasingly active in Russia. In the words of head of the Russian Interior Ministry staff Arkady Kosachev, every second robbery, blackmail and drug trafficking case, every third theft and burglary, every fifth murder and rape are committed by Caucasians.

Press Review for 7 Apr

LD0704054993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0455 GMT 7 Apr 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

Moscow April 7 TASS—"A Partner's Image Instead of Enemy's One" is the headline under which the government newspaper ROSSIISKIYE VESTI carries a commentary by Max Roys on the results of the Russian-U.S. summit meeting in Vancouver.

Speaking highly of the summit, he expresses the following opinion about a further development of the political situation in Russia: "The West has no doubts that the April referendum is an utterly obvious trap for President Boris Yeltsin. And, maybe it is the courage of the Russian president who, beyond any doubt, is aware of the true goal of the parliamentarians, that has once again staggered the North American political figures and international news analysts".

Under the obtaining conditions, there is no possibility for a real coalition government in Russia, political scientist Andranik Migranyan, member of the Presidential Council, said in an interview with ROSSIISKIYE VESTI. The main cause of such a state of affairs, he believes, is in the fact that "no normal multi-party system has taken shape in society" and that "there are no real structured parties" in parliament.

After the Ninth Congress of the People's Deputies, Russia has witnessed in practice the polarisation of political forces while the centrist Civil Union, which could realistically join a coalition, has failed, Migrabyan maintains.

"A falsification of referendum results is practically ruled out," Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Commission of the All- Russia Referendum, told PRAVDA. He mentioned the adoption of a reliable system for the registration of voting papers, emphasising that the polling procedure will be also monitored by deputies, journalists, and representatives of various rival parties.

According to his data, about 60 per cent of more than 160 million citizens of Russia entered in the lists of voters are to take part in the polling. All Russians of the former Soviet Union, who are granted Russian citizenship by the referendum date, will be able to go to the polls.

Colonel General Dmitriy Volkogonov, adviser to the president of the Russian Federation on defence affairs, believes that in the current situation it is essential to draft an electoral law and hold a new election of a president and parliament as soon as possible. In an interview with ROSSIISKIYE VESTI, Volkogonov expresses the conviction that the Congress of People's Deputies turned out to be "an entity unable to function efficiently" and that therefore it should not be re-elected.

Volkogonov calls for a country-wide accord on major issues in the belief that no force now can lead the country out of the deep crisis single-handed.

Oleg Soskovets, chairman of the Russian Committee on Metallurgy, writes in ROSSIISKIYE VESTI about the need to introduce adjustments to the reform and to the current economic policy. He points out that Russia's metallurgy undergoes a crisis now. According to his data, output decreased by 17.1 per cent in the sector as a whole, with that in ferrous metallurgy going down by 17.5 per cent and in non-ferrous metallurgy by 21.7 per cent.

"The slump in metallurgy is directly connected with the imbalance of deliveries inside the sector which has to operate at a time when the economic relations of CIS countries have not been adjusted, Soskovets points out.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (RED STAR) raises the problem of the 1993 draft into the Russian Army. The newspaper perceives main difficulties in manning the army and the navy in the damage done in recent years to the prestige of the person in military uniform, as well as in this year' legalised deferments from the draft for a number of categories of draft-age people.

The newspaper TRUD reports that President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan and Kenneth T. Derr, Chevron corporation chairman and CEO, on Tuesday signed a memorandum on the establishment of the CIS largest joint venture TengizChevrOil (TCO).

Already this year the TCO is to ensure the production and transportation of three tonnes of oil according to traditional scheme, subsequently 12 million and ultimately 36 million tonnes of oil a year.

In all, 900 million tonnes of high-quality oil is expected to be produced at the Tengiz oil field and nearby Korolev oil field. Two billion dollars are to be invested in the project in the coming two to three years.

TRUD runs a commentary by prominent poet Yevgeniy Yevtushenko on secret archival materials, which includes a story of relationships between former KGB chief Yuriy Andropov and Yevtushenko. The poet writes that he is winding up his teaching activities in the United States and is to return to Russia in May.

MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA carries an interview with Professor Galina Sillaste, coordinator of the "Women of the world against narcotics" movement, who believes that "drug addiction in Russia assumes threatening proportions". According to data available with her, 24 per cent of opinion poll respondents in Moscow used narcotics if only once.

Officials Comment on Results of Vancouver Summit

Kozyrev on Links to START

MK0604110493 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Unattributed report published in "In Brief" column: "Kozyrev on Talks in Canada"]

[Text] Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev, during a stopover in Kamchatka on his way from Vancouver back to Moscow, noted in conversation with journalists that the implementation of the cooperation agreements reached at the meeting between Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton largely depends on the ratification of the START II Treaty by the Russian parliament.

Replying to a question about the prospects for the ratification of this treaty, Andrey Kozyrev stated: "Thank God, nothing of what has been signed and what has been agreed on in Vancouver is subject to ratification. What we have seen is agreements between the executive authorities of both sides." START II is a different matter. "I hope that the Supreme Soviet will not place a stumbling block in the way of Russia's integration into the world economic community. If the treaty is not ratified, fear will reemerge and mutual suspicion will reappear. And, as a result, the Russian people will not get the access to markets, and not get the new jobs or, let us say, the American scholarships that were talked about during the negotiations.... All of this will be pushed to the sidelines while center stage will be taken up by the need to tighten belts still further and engage in the arms race," the minister said.

Assessing the results of the summit meeting, Andrey Kozyrev stressed: "Perhaps for the first time in the past 60 years this meeting has focused not on matters of war and peace but on economic problems. Generally speaking, this is the first major conversation with the Americans on purely economic questions. And its second feature is the transition from rhetoric to action. The previous stage was that of the formation of partnership relations—a stage that had to be passed. And now the stage of implementation has begun. In other words, the general understanding on partnership is being translated into the language of concrete projects in a whole series of fields."

Shokhin on 'Partnership' With U.S.

OW0604162893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1550 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Vancouver, a goal was attained which is vitally important for Russia and its economy: we have gained equitable access to the world markets, Vice-President Aleksandr Shokhin told our special correspondent Boris Grishchenko shortly after the Vancouver summit. "Here in Vancouver, there was no discussion of "how much to give Russia," he continued. What was discussed is the mode of partnership," he added.

Shokhin quoted Yeltsin as saying that "most of Russia's proposals and demands were accepted as fair. We brought to Vancouver proposals for equitable cooperation and removal of discriminatory barriers, not requests for aid." Analyzing the declaration of the Vancouver summit, Shokhin said that the Russian and American presidents had done a great deal to work out a mechanism of Russia's interaction with the rest of the world. Aid as such is only part of the package.

Among the main results of the summit is the restructuring of foreign debt which Russia inherited from the former Soviet Union, said Shokhin. The Paris Club's decision to postpone repayment of the Russian debt for ten years is the direct result of the preparations for the Vancouver summit by the forces which are trying to support Russian democracy. Shokhin expressed the "legitimate hope" that a similar decision would be taken during the talks with the London Club of creditor-countries. In his estimate, this will allow Russia to use about $22 Bn [billion] for economic stabilization. At the end of the year, creditors will be ready to discuss 1994 payments with us, he said. It is not ruled out that a similar decision will be taken, because we cannot pay back a sum of about $16 Bn dollars, he said.

Speaking about other components of Clinton's package, Shokhin said, "An unbiased reader of the Vancouver documents will not repeat the statement that the West is only talking about aid to Russia. As we see, all of the world's industrialized states are getting involved in this process." Shokhin believes that the American president was very serious about drafting a program for long-term aid to Russia. The information received during the summit will allow Clinton to present a convincing report on his program for cooperation with the Yeltsin team to Congress and American tax- payers.

Speaking about the program for promoting Russian reforms (worth about $1.6 Bn), Shokhin said that this was not the financial aid of which Vice-Premier and Finance Minister Boris Fedorov dreams. "He needs cash to take pressure off the budget." Boris Fedorov, who was present during the interview refused to comment.

President Bill Clinton told Russian journalists after the official press conference that the Vancouver program and subsequent efforts are an investment in democratic Russia, in which Clinton has great hopes. This investment will benefit the U.S. and Americans, he said.

More Kozyrev, Shokhin Remarks

OW0604135593 Vladivostok Radiostantsiya Tikhiy Okean Maritime Network in Russian 0715 GMT 6 Apr 93

[From the "Pacific Ocean" Program]

[Text] Part of the Russian delegation which participated in the Yeltsin-Clinton talks in Vancouver stopped at the Petropavlovsk- Kamchatskiy airport on their way home. During the short time while their plane was being refueled for takeoff, journalists had the opportunity to pose a few question to Vice Premier Shokhin, to Foreign Minister Kozyrev, and Minister of Atomic Energy Viktor Mikhaylov. Yuriy Shumitskiy, our Kamchatka correspondent, reports:

[Begin recording] [Shumitskiy] The first question was posed to Viktor Mikhaylov, minister of atomic energy. Why was he at the talks?

[Mikhaylov] There were several questions involved, but the main question of course concerns the market for uranium, the production of which is controlled by the Ministry of Atomic Energy. I must tell you that the technology that we have is the most advanced in the world, and requires 25 times less energy to produce a unit of uranium than U.S. technology. This includes the separation of isotopes [words indistinct] of uranium enrichment. Even though we have such excellent technology and facilities which are not behind the U.S. in terms of the excavation and production of these products, we have only 6 percent of the world market. [passage indistinct] We asked them: Let us share the market. If you would consider [as heard] and support us, then we will engage in contracts with you—it would be much cheaper for your consumers.

[Shumitskiy] Next, Andrey Kozyrev, the Russian foreign minister, answered journalists' questions on the results of the meeting with the U.S. President.

[Kozyrev] The meeting focused not on questions of war and peace—on such things as nuclear disarmament, the threat of war, and so on—but on economic issues. This is probably the first time this has occurred during the last 60 years. This is the first summit, actually the first high-level talks with Americans which exclusively discussed economic problems. The second characteristic of these talks is the shift from words to deeds. In other words, before, we had to establish relations of partnership [as heard]. This was a necessary stage, but today we are at the implementation stage. In other words, the general partnership agreement is being translated into a language of concrete projects over a whole range of fields.

[Shumitskiy] Aleksandr Shokhin, vice premier, supplemented Kozyrev's answer.

[Shokhin] First, I would like to correct the public's opinion which is that the main result of the meeting in Vancouver consisted of a billion dollar aid package. This is not accurate. Speaking of the economic part of the talks, the main result of the meeting in Vancouver was Russia's stating for the first time that it must be an equal partner. This statement was acknowledged and supported. The most important economic questions that we discussed concerned access to world markets. Mikhaylov, the minister of atomic energy and a member of the delegation, probably talked about discussing the problem of access for exporters of Russian uranium to U.S. markets. Although we have not reached any final decisions, there has been some progress. On the question of access to the space market, the commercial space market was discussed, as was the problem of cooperation in the field of conversion. I feel that the discussion of questions on allowing Russia to profit by itself in the world market through the liquidation of discriminatory limitations—such as the COCOM limits, high tariffs, and non-tariff limitations—and thus giving Russia a chance to resolve the tough economic situation it is in was the main issue this meeting focused on. Second, there was the discussion of a concrete package of support for Russian reforms. I have to say that on the eve of the Vancouver meeting, maybe largely because it was already scheduled, Russia and a group of creditor countries—the so-called Paris Club—met in Paris and signed an agreement on the postponement of the former Soviet Union's foreign debts. The agreement concerned payments scheduled for 1993. Out of the approximately $17 billion that we would have had to pay for the former Soviet Union's debts, payments of $15 billion were postponed. We will pay it on the eve of the year 2000.

As President Yeltsin has stressed many times, no one will help us to emerge from the current difficult situation if we do not extract ourselves from it. However, we need help in this complex transitional period.

[Shumitskiy] Since you are in Kamchatka now, let me ask you a typical Kamchatka question. You of course know about the fishing situation that persists in a small spot in the Sea of Okhotsk?

[Kozyrev] The thing is, the legal code of the open sea is against us in this case. It is very dangerous to attempt to break it unilaterally, because as you know, we strictly insist on observing this code to the letter in the different regions of the world's oceans where we fish—after all, Russian fishermen catch fish near the shores of Africa and Latin America. You know about the events in Argentina, where the current argument about whether or not a ship enters territorial waters virtually evolves around a few meters. On the other hand, we do have unique resources. We are talking here about immature fish and about biological resources. We have posed this question, and I must say that several countries are reacting in a very positive way to the idea of introducing a special procedure. Several countries, and especially those who actively fish here, are naturally resisting, and all this takes time. Naturally, talks on such a difficult subject will take some time. As to more decisive actions, we do not mind implementing them during the talks. There is a whole complex of, let us say, measures that can be carried out so as to create certain conditions, to limit or even, according to one expression, squeeze out. All of this can be contained within the code of the open sea. Let us imagine a situation when someone is fishing, and simultaneously, military training is taking place in the same region of the open sea. No one forbids it. However, this is no longer a question for the Foreign Ministry. We have nothing against the conducting of military exercises in this part of the Sea of Okhotsk.

We, the Far East residents, and the Committee for Fishing Industry present this question in a slightly different way: We propose establishing a moratorium, so that neither we nor they will fish there.

[Shumitskiy] Russian Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin concluded the news conference by expressing his attitude toward early presidential elections.

[Shokhin] I think that if the Russian citizens answered all the questions positively, including the question of early presidential elections, this would be the best result.

The president is not afraid of early elections, and of course the people's deputies should fear them more. In any case, the present political situation harms the economy. Why? Because—and this is a tradition in any country—when an election campaign starts, the economy has to pay for it. When President Clinton was asked how he feels about the referendum and its possible results, he said only one thing, namely, that for the first time, the Russian people were given a chance to make a choice; and that the future of Russia was in the hands of its people. This is how he evaluates the situation. [end recording]

Deputies' Reaction

OW0604124993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1227 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Commenting on the results of the Vancouver summit, Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet's Committee for International Affairs and Foreign Economic Relations, Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, told INTERFAX that "there was a very friendly attitude towards the Russian president." He said, however, that it would be too risky to emphasize that the U.S. is giving aid precisely to Boris Yeltsin". "This might be counterproductive to his reputation and provoke statements to the effect that he is dancing to the American tune," said Ambartsumov.

Speaking about the economic aspect of the American support for the Russian reform, Ambartsumov noted that "if Americans are going to get back to the Marshall Plan, they must see that their aid is not abstractly general and that adequate control is established over its utilization".

Speaking about the political importance of the Vancouver talks, he said that "Russia must ensure that its involvement in the peace-keeping action in Yugoslavia should not slide down to participation in possible NATO operations in this region".

The Vancouver talks on the eve of the April referendum represent an additional vote of confidence to the president by the world community, and an appeal to the Russian citizens to prevent a roll- back to the old times, People's Deputy Aleksey Surkov, who is the coordinator of the parliamentary coalition of reforms, told INTERFAX.

He laid special emphasis on the extension of a loan to private entrepreneurs. Such loans will enhance Boris Yeltsin's prestige in the eyes of private businessmen, he said.

The Vancouver summit is particularly important on the eve of the Tokyo meeting which is also expected to give its support to the Russian reforms and extend aid to it, above all know-how.

Surkov is convinced that the opposition would launch a slanderous campaign to lower the importance of the Vancouver talks.

Opposition Member Cited

OW0604184793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1711 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The president went to get handouts once again;" [quotation marks as received] moreover, the package of American aid amounting to $1.6 Bn [billion] "will not be able to play a significant role in terms of improving the state of Russia's economy," a leading member of the Russian Unity opposition bloc, Mikhail Chelnokov, told Interfax on Tuesday [6 April]. According to him, it's pointless to receive humanitarian aid from the West, since it contributes solely to the "enrichment of Mafia structures." "What we need is mutually beneficial international agreements: Russia does have commodities it can share with the West, but on the basis of mutual benefit, and this is what the opposition intends to press for," the deputy pointed out.

Chelnokov qualified the Yeltsin-Kozyrev foreign policy as a "policy of betraying national interests." According to him, President Boris Yeltsin "acted more than incorrectly, when he appointed Andrey Kozyrev as foreign minister two days before signing the bill on the Council of Ministers, under which a candidate for the post of foreign minister had to be endorsed by the Supreme Soviet. According to Chelnokov, Kozyrev had no chance of being endorsed.

Media Continue Assessment of Vancouver Summit

Yeltsin-Clinton Doctrine Examined

LD0604142693 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The start to this week was marked by the meeting between the Russian and U.S. presidents in Vancouver. Those taking part in the meeting assessed it as an undoubted success. The decisions adopted, in Boris Yeltsin's opinion, mark the start of a new phase in Russo-American relations. In Vancouver, Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev talked about the Yeltsin-Clinton doctrine. Our correspondent, Igor Ambrosov, tries to get to the bottom of this doctrine.

[Ambrosov] At present there is little material available to help analyze the doctrine. Strictly speaking, we only have the text of the Vancouver declaration which was agreed on by the Russian and U.S. Presidents. No other joint documents were adopted at the meeting. As for the declaration, it is, if you will excuse the play on words, still nothing more than a declaration of intentions. Strictly speaking, it cannot claim to be anything other than this. No other special, let alone detailed, joint documents were prepared for the Presidents' meeting and the most the Presidents could do was to agree on the agenda for the future. We should all be warned straight away against excessive euphoria. Let us start with the $1.6 billion. Of course this is great. But Clinton does not have his own presidential funds. In the United States it is Congress which manages the state dollars. There is still no sign that Congress has already approved the allocation of this sum. We will get the dollars which Congress has already approved, but not the entire 1.5 billion or so. It is no accident that the U.S. President said in an exclusive interview with Russian journalists that he hoped that he would succeed in convincing Congress about the need to support his proposals.

The second major problem is the way in which Russia and the United States are to cooperate together. The declaration states that working groups will be set up with the participation of high- ranking representatives of both governments with broad powers for cooperation within the field of the economy, science, and technology. A commission is to be set up separately which will deal with cooperation in the field of power engineering and space. Let us agree—working groups are relatively modest institutions which do not directly guarantee that bilateral cooperation will take off straight away. As far as President Yelstin's concern regarding the COCOM list and the discriminatory Jackson-Vanik amendment is concerned, President Clinton said rather obliquely that these problems did not come within his remit and said that Congress would decide the fate of the amendment and COCOM lists.

The last point—but by no means the least important—Clinton's package, judging from a number of statements, has the support of legislators of both the Democrat and Republican Parties in the United States. Thus, there seems to be a national consensus in the United States on policy with regard to Russia. But what about a national consensus in Russia on its policy vis-a-vis the United States? There is obviously still a struggle ahead to achieve a Russian consensus on this.

U.S. Support 'Far Exceeded' Expectations

MK0604111293 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No.7, 6 Apr 93 p 1 (signed to press 5 Apr)

[Vladimir Abarinov report from Vancouver under the "Summit" rubric: "A President to Whom There Is No Alternative. This Is How Boris Yeltsin Described Himself After Receiving 'Clinton Package'"]

[Text] The journalists accredited at the Vancouver summit did not have any grounds for complaints about President Yeltsin. He would easily agree to answer a question or two, he was sparse in his words but relaxed, and was at his best at the concluding press conference. "There is no alternative to Yeltsin, there will be one tomorrow, but not today"—this is the phrase that is bound to go down in the annals. Boris Yeltsin's mood was understandable: The contents of the Clinton package have by far exceeded the Russian side's expectations. The definitive amount of the U.S. aid program to support Russian reforms is $1,622,900,000. This is over 50 percent greater than the initial figure.

President Clinton is also pleased with the summit's results, although it is already clear that Congress is unlikely to approve the full amount of the appropriations. The Americans do not approve of the idea of aid in general. The Clinton team will have a tough time convincing their countrymen that the Clinton plan is actually in line with U.S. national interests. As a matter of fact, Clinton himself would not call his plan an aid program. "It is an investment program," he insisted, "investment in the future of America." But this is rhetoric and what is needed is real, specific, and palpable arguments. This explains why it was that the extremely full summit agenda included more than forty items.

It may be surmised that the bulk of them related to political matters. The two sides discussed them in a confidential, and therefore frank, manner. In the near future we will learn (or guess) about what understandings have been reached as we see changes in Russia's foreign policy. For example, the Americans are very sensitive about Russian arms exports to Iran, and even more so about a nuclear reactor that is being built there by Russian specialists. Secretary of State Christopher raised this problem in a CNN interview on Saturday, saying that Moscow has demonstrated its willingness to forgo such cooperation with a country regarded by the U.S. as a mainstay of international terrorism.

When asked by a SEGODNYA correspondent about whether the U.S. President believed that Yeltsin had to make unilateral concessions in exchange for an economic aid package, Bill Clinton said he did not think that Yeltsin had to make concessions. The two sides have clarified some of their positions. They are prepared to consider any problems, including those born out of the consequences of the Cold War. Boris Yeltsin deemed it necessary to add: "I am not afraid of reproaches because I do not see anything my opponents can latch onto."

The Russian stance, as far as I can judge, was in fact distinguished by it assertiveness and maybe even its toughness. The partnership should be based on equal rights and the competition ought to become fair. Russia has something to offer both to the world market and to that of the United States, but in order for this to happen all snags need to be removed—particularly the notorious Jackson-Vanick amendment should be repealed, and Russia should be included into the general system of trade preferences, thus freeing Russian-U.S. exports from too high customs duties. "The American law continues to categorize Russia among communist countries," Boris Yeltsin said in that connection. "This should be changed, and President Clinton has agreed with me."

The question, however, is not that simple, and the U.S. President is not omnipotent. Bill Clinton assured journalists that immediately upon his return to the United States he will, together with Congressional leaders, review the list of restrictions imposed on trade with Russia; some of them are likely to be revoked at once, the rest will require further analysis. If Congress sees that there are no more refuseniks in Russia, the Jackson-Vanick amendment will be repealed. This is beginning to sound like serious talk. The press conference in general has convinced us that the two Presidents have found a common language. What is it that unites them except the need for conducting a political dialogue? According to Boris Yeltsin, "We are both men of business and, to some extent, idealists." Local newspapers have dubbed the Vancouver summit "the Three B's" for the initials of the names of Bill, Boris, and Brian.

Need To Sell Package to Domestic Audiences

PM0604132593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Apr 93 First Edition p 7

["Commentary" by Sergey Demidov, deputy editor of the international department: "The Russian-American 'Economic Summit' Has Ended in the Canadian City of Vancouver: America Has Placed Its Stake on the Table. But What Will the G-7 Wager?"]

[Text] So America, through its President, Bill Clinton, has, it seems, again put its money on Russia—to the tune of $1.6 billion. Such a sum was promised Moscow by Washington during the now-ended two-day meeting in Vancouver between the American leader and Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin.

It is planned that these resources be invested in programs whose implementation could, according to the head of the U.S. Democrat administration, be started up immediately and which are "targeted," as Clinton put it, "at supporting political and economic reforms." The United States intends, in particular, to resume the sale of grain to Russia, for which an extra $700 million in credit will be granted; to provide aid in the construction of housing and vocational retraining for Russian servicemen on an experimental basis; and to support the formation and development of small and medium-sized businesses.

The basis of the Bill Clinton "economic package," which, as the Russian president himself stressed, is what it will henceforth be called, was laid by the previous Republican team of George Bush. And was even "blessed" in the American Congress last year. (To which, incidentally, my meticulous fellow-journalists instantly drew attention during the final press conference given by the two top officials of state).

In principle the White House incumbent indirectly confirmed this "hypothesis" by avoiding a direct answer to such a "tricky" comment. The innovation in Washington's economic initiative declared in Vancouver is that three-quarters of all the money intended for Russia will be "pumped" or "redeemed" via private rather than government channels. Clinton thereby insures the American taxpayers, as it were, against the risk of most of their hard-earned money rapidly disappearing "yet again," in other words, against a hefty proportion of the new appropriations ending up in the deep pockets of an army of Russian officials whose numbers grow at virtually the speed of light. Not just the United States, but other Western countries too, which have made a far greater contribution to humanitarian aid and support for faltering Russia, have witnessed the country's plight through their own bitter experience over the last 12 months or more.

As far as the question of the specific mechanism for distributing Clinton's "package" is concerned, it is effectively still up in the air. Both leaders confined themselves merely to the most general statements to the effect that such a mechanism had already been elaborated. Pray God that nothing smashes it! Many problems hindering economic partnership (this was repeatedly said in Vancouver)—the Jackson-Vanik amendment, for example, which has "smothered" trade between the two countries hitherto—would then be resolved, it was agreed.

Understandably, the U.S President will still clearly have repeatedly to demonstrate to his fellow-citizens that his "Russian 'package' will mean new jobs and new investment for Americans and our allies in the world" and that "today we are investing resources not just in the future of Russia but in the future of America too." There is clearly no need for him to persuade the G-7 of this. Clinton has only to clarify whether his administration thinks there is no alternative to Yeltsin in Russia today, as the Russian president himself directly stated in Vancouver, or whether it does not pin its hopes for reforms in our country on any specific individual. That will determine, in my view, the stake the G-7 foreign and finance ministers place on Russia at the Tokyo meeting in mid-April, given that the West already burned its fingers with the first and last president of the ex-USSR.

Yeltsin will now be forced to beat off the attacks of the Russian extreme right-wing opposition for having returned to the fatherland with nothing much to show. Clinton's statement that he does not deem it fair to say that the president of Russia has made many political concessions in exchange for commitments from the United States will scarcely save him from charges of "selling out the motherland." The meagerness of the sum of $1.6 billion won't halt the vehement critics of the president's course...

Of course, this "first Russian-American meeting," as Yeltsin christened the Vancouver summit, did discuss purely political problems in addition to economic questions. Mutual understanding and agreement was not achieved on them all. But that is what politics is all about. The stakes here are greater than in any game of chance.

Summit's Effectiveness Questioned

MK0604114693 Moscow FEDERATSIYA in Russian, No. 38, 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Yuriy Subbotin article published in "World and Us" column: "On First Name Terms With America?"]

[Text] As long as we have been a country only with an unpredictable past, this provided a guaranteed income for satirical writers, sometimes giving food for outright malice, but not much more than that. Recently, however, our future too has become extremely unpredictable.

And this has already begun to seriously worry distant foreign parts. By all accounts, there is really nothing that can frighten us any more. But they, who have become accustomed to a stable existence, are frightened at the prospect of more and more "Upper Voltas with nuclear weapons" appearing across the vast expanses of the former USSR.

It was obviously under the shadow of this concern that the hastily organized summit meeting in Vancouver took place. Bill Clinton, to whose face the mandatory American smile seemed to have been glued forever, this time looked as though he periodically left it in the makeup room. That, however, did not prevent the two presidents from talking about the success of the talks at their final press conference.

From the moral and psychological point of view, these statements appear to be well substantiated. Both leaders have scored a certain number of political points. Bill Clinton, having promised us aid that had been pledged but not delivered by his predecessor, intends at the outset of his career to earn a reputation as a man of business. Our president, for his part, will undoubtedly credit the $1.6 billion mentioned by his U.S. counterpart to his propaganda account, which is vital in the approach to the referendum on confidence.

As for the actual effect that the results of the Vancouver talks should produce on the situation in both countries, on the situation in the world at large, and on our sick economy in particular, it can hardly be impressive.

First, the sum of $1.6 billion speaks for itself. The Russian president recalled quite appropriately that up to 100 billion [currency unspecified] has been invested annually in Germany's new laender (the former GDR), which are comparable in terms of population size with Moscow City and Moscow Oblast. And second, this $1.6 billion has yet to be received.

As U.S. observers point out, Bill Clinton has found himself between the devil and the deep blue sea. On one hand, he must in every possible way seek to demonstrate that this modest aid package is large enough to yield substantial results. On the other, he has to try to belittle the already insignificant scale of subsidies and loans to make them more palatable to the American public.

True, this time, if the aid is actually provided, the chances of its reaching those it is aimed at should be substantially higher. Up to now this currency, so loved by us, has for the most part been irrepressibly heading for the West, where it ended up, but this time in the accounts of enterprising people with Russian citizenship. Now the Americans have decided to adopt a method that had been "road tested" in the practice of packaging humanitarian aid whereby not only its delivery and distribution was overseen, but, according to some reports, even the process of its consumption. So they now intend to distribute the credits for the most part themselves in the regions, bypassing the Moscow authorities, who, in the opinion of many Western politicians, are progressively less and less in control of the situation in their own country.

This will undoubtedly raise the effectiveness of the credit schemes. Will this, however, help raise the authority of the center and consolidate Russia, which is already coming apart at the seams?

Perhaps it was in order to make up for the awkwardness that is inevitable in such cases that both sides so often pronounced the word "partnership." Meanwhile, a TV commentator was saying with great enthusiasm that the presidents had easily found a common language, and by the end of the first day of negotiations they were on "'thou' terms" with each other (it is not quite clear though how Clinton managed that because as far as we know, he does not speak Russian, while in modern English the pronoun "thou" is absent).

Partnership, to be sure, is not at all a bad thing. It would be desirable, however, if this were a partnership of equals so that we could really be on "'thou' terms" with America in the best sense of this expression.

Russian Disarmament 'Crux' of Package

PM0604181993 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 93 p 3

[Yuriy Glukhov "Observer's Opinion": "Clinton Sets Example"]

[Text] The beat of propaganda drums over the success of the Vancouver meeting is probably designed to drown out the voice of common sense, but that voice should be heeded so as not to experience disappointment once again.

One should first take into account the fact that never before has a foreign aid program for Russia been so well thought-out. According to B. Yeltsin, it is scheduled almost down to the day and the hour, and also down to the facility. It has been compiled by the Americans and will be implemented while they carry out the appropriate supervision.

The thrust of the U.S. philanthropy is no secret.

First, to help small and medium enterprises, to shape and support a new class—the Russian comprador bourgeoisie, and to strengthen the social base underpinning the current regime—the regime of the nouveau riche.

Second, to ensure that the Americans' planned capital investments are repaid. Naturally, the most promising avenue in this respect is the potential extraction of raw-material resources, the development of the oil extraction and gas industry, for instance. Something that is also planned.

Third, there is concern for the well-being of U.S. farmers. While paying for the credit for grain, Russia is funding the development of U.S. agriculture at a time when its own remains neglected.

Lastly, particular attention is being devoted to the Russian disarmament program. The United States is willing to take part both in dismantling nuclear weapons and in building military settlements in order, for instance, to speed up the Russian troop withdrawal from the Baltics.

Disarming Russia is accordingly the crux of the program. As Kozyrev said, the implementation of the Yeltsin-Clinton aid agreements will largely depend on the Russian Supreme Soviet's ratification of the START II Treaty. Yet this treaty, in the opinion of many experts, is detrimental to Russian security.

In Vancouver B. Clinton set Russia's politicians the example of upholding a country's national interests. Not only in this respect, but also through respect for the legislature. Unlike B. Yeltsin, he has repeatedly emphasized that all his accords must be approved by the U.S. Congress. B. Clinton's presidential rule is in sharp contrast with the model being foisted on society by a Russian president who refuses to consider either the parliament or the Congress.

Aid Not Conducive to Good Economy

MK0704071493 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 7, 6 Apr 93 (Signed to Press 5 Apr) p 1

[Mikhail Leontyev article: "West Agrees To Give a Chance Just at the Wrong Time"]

[Text] In what has already become a tradition, in spring a new U.S. President has called on America and the Western community to "rise to the challenge of the time" and provide assistance to Russian democracy at a decisive moment for it. The size of the proposed package is $30 billion. The U.S. President's initiative has evoked an unusually favorable reaction from G-7 leaders. And this backdrop makes all the more obvious the skepticism of experts at financial organizations responsible for concrete aid programs for Russia.

It is noteworthy that Russian leaders too, while expressing their profound gratitude for the support, regard it rather as political, displaying, it would seem, not quite appropriate disrespect for the material aspect of the affair. The main specialists in this field, Aleksandr Shokhin, vice premier, and Sergey Glazyev, minister of foreign economic relations, have repeatedly expressed the opinion recently that we do not need additional credits at all, that instead the West should remove the discriminatory trade barriers, allow Russia access to the world arms market, and grant a substantial deferral on its foreign debt. Last fall Shokhin favored the freezing "until better times" of the $1 billion stabilization credits that had been squeezed out of the IMF with such difficulty, which was what was actually done.

The question might arise: Where does this deficit of enthusiasm and ecstasy over the "third spring attempt" of Western aid come from? Let us recall the previous two:

—in 1991 Grigoriy Yavlinskiy at his own risk devised the Window of Opportunity [Soglasiye na Shans] Program in a bid to use Western support to knock together a Yeltsin-Gorbachev union in the name of a radical market reform. At the time, figures that stunned the imagination were cited—$10-15 billion.

—in 1992 a package of as much as $24 billion was pledged, tied to the "Gaydar team," as a result of which the "Memorandum of Economic Policy" appeared, which died in the anguish of populist handouts and industrial lobbyism.

And now a whole $30 billion. Remember the old joke: "Their cow produces 3,000 liters of milk, but we have already passed a decision whereby ours will yield 5,000...." A careful examination will reveal that there is basically only one component in the package that is changing—the covering of outstanding debts on foreign liabilities. The Window of Opportunity did not take this figure into account; in the "$24 billion" package it constituted approximately half the sum, and today it is already $15-17 billion. Russia will fulfill this part of the program de facto anyway, because it is simply in no position to repay these billions.

It is another matter that in 1993 none of the Russian leaders has actually called for a new package to be provided. It is hard to imagine that Yeltsin will selflessly disown the shower of gold that has fallen over him, but I think that he will be wary of making any efforts, let alone using this factor in his election agitation campaign. The fact is that the program to assist the reform is tied to certain obligations over the reform itself—which the present leadership in the conditions of stiff competition for votes is definitely not going to assume. What talk can there be about a stabilization credit when the current efforts to stabilize the ruble are plain to see?

The heart of the matter is that a large-scale Western aid package makes sense for a quick and radical reform. Yavlinskiy and Gaydar, for all their differences, personified a radical market reform of the "shock-therapy type." Viktor Chernomyrdin, for all his positive assets, does not represent anything of the kind. The reform as a conscious process conducted from above ended or rather ran out of steam by last summer. Today we have been plunged into a protracted transitional period—not a "regulated transition" but precisely spontaneous painful market evolution when it becomes the "progressives'" task to prevent counterreforms and reaction.

Given the present authority and political situation, there will be no "Marshall plan" for Russia "to eat." As for the specific $1.6 billion package promised by Clinton, you are welcome to it, plus $1 billion in untied credits—if they are provided—and in fact this will go to cover part of the huge budget deficit. This may help Yeltsin survive but it will not be conducive to a proper economic education.

Aid Package Examined

PM0704113593 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 93 p 7

[Article by S. Ivanov: "Protocol on Latest Good Intentions"]

[Text] For the United States there is no more important task than normalizing trade and economic relations with Japan. That was more or less Bill Clinton's thought just a few days before the Vancouver meeting with the Russian president. Of course, this was not the best beginning for the Canadian summit but it was quite accurate for an understanding of Washington's foreign policy priorities.

Back in Little Rock last December, the newly elected U.S. President stated his intention primarily to pay attention to the country's domestic economic problems. Any foreign policy contacts should accord with that main aim, which was entirely logical. Under the new conditions of the virtually total lack of global strategic confrontation between East and West and the end of the cold war, there is a marked sense that the emphasis in U.S. foreign policy has shifted to potential new conflicts which could threaten U.S. national interests, primarily Japan and its enormous technological potential, Germany and the EC with their well-integrated economy, and the Near East as a storehouse of energy carriers.

On this political map of the new world order Russia's place is so far still in the leading five. That the Russian Federation ranks so high is by no means because of the great U.S. economic interest in us but rather because of the potential threat which could come from an explosive political situation in the country. In my view it is in this key that we should examine what the Russian president called "Bill Clinton's economic package," which has become the main result of the Canadian meeting.

Only by stretching a point can the $1.6 billion offered to us be called a resounding success. But it was scarcely possible either to expect a large sum under present economic conditions in the United States itself. Nor can we exaggerate the importance of the precise breakdown of this sum. Stephen Cohen, a well-known specialist on Russian affairs, doubted that Russia will be able to control the distribution of funds: "In Russia even newspapers do not reach readers," he confided. In addition to all the rest the charitable sums seem ridiculous. For instance, the program to construct housing for Russian officers is assessed at $6 million. For your information a three-room apartment in Moscow costs about $60,000. Can these funds remove the social tension in the army? Will humanitarian aid and U.S. intentions help to reconstruct individual sectors of Russian industry and lead Russia itself out of the profound sociopolitical crisis? These questions are rhetorical rather than anything else.

Nonetheless entirely specific progress was reached in Canada in Russian-U.S. relations. Primarily it is a case of intentions to develop trade and economic relations between Russia and the United States. The present state of trade is assessed at just $3.4 billion. To change this figure, shameful to both powers, in May this year a commission will be created for bilateral business cooperation headed by Shokhin and Brown. In addition it is planned to expand the framework of most-favored nation status for Russian goods on the U.S. market and it is planned to give technical assistance in monitoring exports from Russia. And perhaps the most important thing consists of Clinton's intentions to get Congress to grant the Russian Federation the right to sell Russian highly enriched uranium on the foreign market, including the United States.

The thesis which was heard most often in the corridors of the meeting to the effect that only its own people can help Russia during the summit developed into an unofficial "protocol of intent" to promote this process.

Yeltsin Meets U.S. Congressional Delegation in Kremlin

LD0704091693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0839 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—Russian President Boris Yeltsin met in the Kremlin with a U.S. Congress delegation which arrived in Moscow yesterday from Kiev. The delegation is headed by Richard Gephardt, leader of the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, and Robert Michel, leader of the Republican minority in the House.

According to information released by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, the delegation is making a six-day tour of Ukraine and Russia in order to "demonstrate support for the process of democratization in these countries and become better acquainted with the course of economic reform." In addition to Moscow, the delegation members intend to visit Nizhniy Novgorod and St. Petersburg. They will have a meeting with Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, visit the Constitutional Court, and examine a number of sites which are being privatized. This visit is a first step in the efforts of the U.S. Congress to put together an "aid package" for Russia.

Comments on Referendum

LD0704114493 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1055 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—President Boris Yeltsin is asking Russian citizens to answer "yes" to all four questions tabled at the 25 April referendum. During talks in the Kremlin with a U.S. congressional delegation, he recalled that he himself tabled just one question for the referendum—on confidence in the president—but the Congress of People's Deputies foisted another three on him. As we know, parliament added extra questions on the socioeconomic policies being pursued by the president and the government and about attitudes to early presidential and parliamentary elections.

However, as Vyacheslav Kostikov, press secretary for the Russian president, told journalists, Boris Yeltsin "is not afraid of either these questions or early elections."

Referring to the results of the Russo-American summit meeting in Vancouver, the president of Russia noted that the agreement reached there on support for Russia was only the first stage in cooperation. The objective now is to secure the repeal of many restrictions in U.S. legislation which discriminate against Russia. This would enable the country to take advantage of its huge potential to earn significantly greater sums.

After expressing support for Russia's reforms, the U.S. congressmen stressed that "partnership with Russia is an investment for the future of the United States."

Praises Clinton's Support

OW0704114493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1128 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Yeltsin told American congressmen on Wednesday [7 April] that during the next few days he would make several trips around the country, preparing for the national referendum, scheduled for April 25. To begin with, he will go to the miners' center of Kemerovo and to Yakutia.

Yeltsin said that, in view of the "perfidious questions imposed on the referendum by the congress," he would urge the nation to give a positive response to all of the four questions. He also said that he was afraid neither of early presidential elections nor of the questions imposed on him.

He praised Bill Clinton's position during the talks in Vancouver, his support for Russian democracy and his wish to create the conditions capable of making Russia a strong and prosperous country.

Joint Testing of 'Plasma Weapon' Proposed With U.S.

PM0104165793 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Viktor Litovkin report: "On the Eve of Vancouver Russia Proposes to United States Joint Experiment with Plasma Weapon"]

[Text] As the editorial office has learned, during Russian President Boris Yeltsin's talks at the summit with U.S. President Bill Clinton in Vancouver our country may propose staging on the Pacific atoll of Kwajalein a large-scale joint experiment in repelling a missile attack.

Russian scientists who have worked for a long time in the top-secret sphere of the defense industry have given this experiment the name "Trust." Scientific and production centers also took part in preparing the project, including such centers as the experimental physics scientific research institute in the closed city of Arzamas-16, the Central Aerohydrodynamics Institute, the Central Scientific Research Institute of Machine Building in Kaliningrad, outside Moscow, where our best missiles were created, the Scientific Research Institute of Radio Instrument Making, which is part of the structure of the supersecret interstate joint-stock company "Vympel," leading institutes of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and other collectives.

What is the project about? Academician Rimiliy Avramenko, the scientific director of the work and chief designer at the Scientific Research Institute of Radio

Instrument Making, told me that what is involved here is an experiment with a so-called "plasma weapon," which can hit any object moving in the earth's atmosphere—be it a missile, a warhead, an aircraft, or some other artificial or natural heavenly body such as a meteorite.

This is accomplished using an existing technological base without putting any components into space and using the kinetic energy of the object itself, which is intercepted electronically by a plasmoid [kotoromu stavit svoyeobraznuyu elektronnuyu podnozhku plazmoid] created by facilities on the ground—microwave or optical (laser) generators, and antennae and other systems.

Furthermore, the energy directed by the earth-based components of the gun—and this is clear from our diagram—is focused not on the target itself but on its flight path in the area of the atmosphere directly ahead of it. It ionizes that area of atmosphere and totally upsets the aerodynamics of the missile or aircraft. The object leaves its trajectory and is destroyed by enormous stresses. It is virtually impossible to countering this effect of terrestrial energy.

Academician Avramenko asserts that in this form of ABM and antiaircraft defense plasma weapon it is possible for the first time to combine in a single unit radar observation systems and systems for the electronic delivery of the plasmoid—the kill mechanism—to the target at the speed of light. This makes the plasmoid a virtually invulnerable weapon providing guaranteed protection against any attack from space or the upper or lower strata of the atmosphere.

The radar observation systems can lock onto a target or group of targets at a distance of 100 km, and the plasmoid destroys them at an altitude of up to 50 km according to the task in question. Furthermore, you do not need to build great power stations for this—the energy output of a few dozen domestic storage batteries for each of the powerful generators belonging to the complex is quite sufficient to make such protection feasible.

Star wars and attack by nuclear terrorists and other aggressors will hold no fears for any state with such a supergun for its protection.

As we have already said, this gun was created in Russia. The research on it has gone beyond the laboratory walls and is being tested in real life. But a full-scale experiment against real targets—ICBM's and supersonic planes—requires great financial outlay. Our country is proposing that the United States pool its efforts with us in this and jointly create a global antimissile protection system.

Rimiliy Avramenko believes that such an experiment could be conducted on the U.S. atoll of Kwajalein in the Pacific, where the appropriate material and technical base exists and where the U.S. military have already conducted a number of tests in the SDI program. [accompanying diagram shows possible configuration]

Russia would supply the necessary equipment there on board aircraft carriers [avianosnyy korabl] and other ships. It is well known that Russia has considerable achievements and advantages in the sphere of creating powerful microwave generators (potential components of the plasma gun) and in the sphere of the new science of plasma-gas dynamics. The United States would supply the solid-state electronics and computer technology. The missiles for the experiment could be launched either from the territory of our country or from U.S. test ranges.

Such an experiment, in the Russian scientist's opinion, using our equipment and proportional U.S. financial participation, will be relatively inexpensive at just $300 million. That is half the amount planned by the U.S. budget for the creation of its own plasma weapon. In the experts' opinion, if the United States continues working on this problem independently it will cost it $30 billion. But it is not the only country which could use the two countries' military-technical achievements for the general good.

I asked the academician whether or not the "Trust" project contravenes the 1972 Treaty signed by the two countries on the limitation of ABM systems.

"No," he replied. "That treaty makes no mention of joint work on global protection against missile attack. Twenty years ago it could not have occurred to anyone that such a thing would be possible. In those days that was not only unscientific, it was hostile science fiction."

Well, fantastic projects can become reality too, not only in science and technology but in international political relations and even in the sphere of international security and the defense sectors. Admittedly, some Russian experts doubt that the Americans will accept our proposals on the joint antimissile experiment. People in the United States, they say, are not very fond of admitting Russian advances in military matters, much less reinforcing and spreading them.

But I think that this fear is also a throwback to the old days.

Project Leader Comments

PM0604113993 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Report by Aleksandr Ostrovskiy and Yuriy Shipovskiy; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] According to reports from Washington, problems and prospects for Russian export of space satellites, communication facilities, and weapons, including new ones, such as for example the plasma weapon, are to be discussed among other topics at the talks between Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton.

[Ostrovskiy] This plasma weapon could become the most reliable umbrella against any aerospace attack. Star Wars and nuclear terrorists would pose no threat to states posessing such a defensive superweapon, which could even be used to mend ozone holes.

Russian scientists have proposed that this joint experiment project be called Trust [preceding word in English].

[Academician R. Avramenko, scientific leader of the project] This weapon belongs to the category of weapons which act not on the attacking object itself but on the conditions governing its movement. The closest analogy would be a slippery road. It is something resembling slippery conditions, or literally a slippery environment which causes an aircraft or a rocket to be thrown off course.

This specific initiative is being put forward by us as a development of the Yeltsin-Bush initiative of last year. They were the first to propose then that the possibility be considered of elaborating specific projects, specific work toward the creation of a global defense system.

Official: U.S. Grain Aid To Be Sold Through Exchanges

OW0604130293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1229 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] General manager of the Russian Commodity and Raw Materials Exchange, Aleksey Vlasov, who has visited the U.S. as a member of the delegation of the Russian Government's Commission for Humanitarian and Technical Aid, told INTERFAX that during the visit the agreement was reached on the selling of the grain, sent to Russia as humanitarian aid, through Russian exchanges. To quote Vlasov, the U.S. Government will send Russia 520,000 tons of grain, 260,000 tons of corn and about 40,000 tons of rice. The money thus earned will be put on the bank account of the Commission which will use it for implementing its programs. The grain to come will be sold through the Russian Commodity and Raw Materials Exchange and through the Russian Grain Exchange (Saratov). However, the participation of other exchanges is not ruled out, he added.

Vlasov also announced that the first ship, loaded with grain, is to leave the U.S. on May 5 to 15, and arrive in the ports of St. Petersburg, Novotallinnsky and Novorossiysky at the end of May.

At the end of April, the Russian Commodity and Raw Materials Exchange will hold a tender for those willing to buy grain.

Financial Director of the Russian Grain Exchange (RGE) Valeriy Filimonov, informed INTERFAX that at the initial stage, the RGE will handle about 210,000 tons of corn. He also said that at the beginning of May, an American ship is expected to bring corn to the port of St. Petersburg.

He also announced that on April 15 to 20, the RGE is planning to hold forward corn-based trading sessions. According to the Commission for Humanitarian Aid, the price of grain includes the cost of delivery, so 1 ton of corn will cost 30,000 rubles. (In Moscow, one ton of corn costs 35,000 rubles).

West's Support for Yeltsin Seen as 'Mistake'

PM0604132993 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 5

[Commentary by Aleksandr Frolov under the rubric "Observer's Remarks": "You Can't Outwit History"]

[Text] The flood of statements from leaders of developed capitalist countries in support of B. Yeltsin and the "democratic reforms" which he is supposedly carrying out leaves a strange, distressing impression. Leaving aside the blatant interference in our internal affairs, the West is, perhaps, committing a most important historical mistake by facilitating the collapse, first of the Soviet Union, and now of the Russian Federation.

The calculation of Western politicians is understandable: to take advantage of the chance to rid themselves of a dangerous rival in the world arena and turn the Soviet Union politically into a colony or semicolony, and economically into a raw materials appendage, or a raw materials reserve, of the industrially developed countries. But this calculation is shortsighted. The historical Russian state (whatever it is called—the Russian Empire or the Soviet Union) cannot in principle be turned into a colony. It is impossible either to vanquish it in war, or occupy it, or effectively control it from without. Russia can be only a great world power or a geographical repository of chaos that poses a lethal danger to the rest of the world. There is no middle course.

In pushing the development of events along the lines of the second scenario, the West is unleashing forces which will inevitably boomerang against itself. Today as a result of the activity of the antistate forces, Russia is very close to the ideal proclaimed back in the "perestroyka" era, though admittedly just one short little word has dropped out in the intervening years, so it now runs: "Everything is permitted which is forbidden by law." Any attempts to restore even elementary legality are interpreted by the president and his clique as a plot by the "communist inquisition." How might this end? Let us examine just some of the factors operating here.

Narcotics and the Drugs Business

What, pray tell, is the sense in the United States with one hand fighting the drugs mafia in Latin America, and with the other, creating an ideal operational base for the drugs business in the boundless Eurasian area? Yet this is precisely what is happening today.

The territory of the Soviet Union has become a place where drugs dollars and criminal capital in general of any kind can be "laundered" most quickly and most simply of all. Here all manner of international criminals and scoundrels for whom the prisons of many countries have long been pining shelter from the courts and investigations. Moreover, they do not just hide, but are considered respected "businessmen" and seize positions in the economy and extend their influence on the state apparatus. This territory has become the most convenient corridor for the transportation of narcotics from East to West. Finally, in view of the natural and climatic conditions and the potential of the chemical and pharmaceutical industry, the CIS could in the near future become a major world producer of natural and synthetic narcotic substances.

International Terrorism and Illegal Weapons Trade

All the circumstances just enumerated make the CIS potentially the most convenient refuge, and the most efficient center, for terrorist organizations of all sorts of inclinations—from left-wing to right-wing. This is also facilitated by the unchecked spread of arms, including of the most destructive kinds, and the growth in the number of desperate people who have no future, are ready for motiveless violence, and are the next pool of recruits for terrorism. There are quite a few such people, capable in extreme circumstances of acts of aimless violence, among servicemen, in whose hands are weapons of mass destruction.

The ease of access to arms and munitions and the leaky borders make trade in them a most profitable enterprise. And no one today will venture to say precisely how many weapons and how much equipment disappear abroad, and to what destinations. And if fissionable materials are added here, this underground business is capable not only of adding fuel to the flames of regional conflicts, but even of bringing the whole world to the brink of global nuclear catastrophe.

Narcotics and terror are in general a sort of revenge by the deprived on the "civilization" which has battened on their blood. The inclusion of Russia and other "independent states" in the orbit of "civilization," with the status of countries of the "third" and "fourth" worlds, threatens to bring about such a multiplication of these forces of blind destruction that the West may be unable to withstand their onslaught.

The Muslim Factor

We are talking, of course, not of Islam in general, but of so-called Muslim fundamentalism—one of the varieties of modern extremism. Russia and the Soviet Union accumulated world historical experience of extinguishing fundamentalist tendencies, primarily not by violence, but by means of socioeconomic integration, cohabitation, and mutual influence between Slavic and Islamic cultures. Now this restraining factor has been drastically weakened. In the Caucasus and Central Asia hotbeds of religious fanaticism are flaring up and wars are blazing. And at the same time a "window has been opened" for the expansion of Islamic fundamentalism into Europe. A second "window" has arisen in the Balkans, with the disintegration of Yugoslavia. The prospects and the consequences of such a turn of events are virtually unpredictable.

Armenia—A "Second Israel"

The position of this small republic, poor in its own resources but having a rich Armenian diaspora, among ethnically and religiously alien surroundings, is absolutely analogous to the position of Israel in the Near East. It will be able to maintain its "independent" status through the generous aid of the diaspora, for which in turn they will have to constantly fan the flame of the Karabakh conflict; true, it is claimed that so far hopes of such aid are not entirely being justified. But the situation could change, and then a source of tension in the Caucasus is ensured for decades to comes.

The Greater German Empire Factor

The unification of the two Germanies and the simultaneous disintegration of the Warsaw Pact Organization, the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia again summon up the specter of the "Holy Roman Empire of the German nation." The northern and southern flanks of the empire strictly speaking stop at the Gulf of Finland and the Adriatic Sea, but the border of its zone of influence in the East as a whole coincides with the line of the Soviet-German front as of the fall of 1941. In effect it is a question of revising the results of World War II in the East. But who will give guarantees that the revision will be restricted to East Europe and the Balkans? The history of Europe gives no such guarantees.

We can limit ourselves to this short synopsis, without touching for the time being on the new situation in the Far East, which is also fraught with serious contradictions.

Does the "First World" understand what a mine it has planted under its own security and prosperity by bringing about a monocentric, or to be more precise, eccentric, world order? Judging by the words and deeds of the majority of its leaders, it either does not understand, or hopes to keep the situation in Russia under control by means of "peacekeeping forces" under UN or NATO flags. But this is a dangerous illusion.

I will repeat what I began with. Russia can be neither vanquished by war, nor occupied. It can only be governed by drawing on knowledge of the cultural and historical traditions and peculiarities of Russian statehood, and not on borrowed bourgeois democratic models. The current ruling regime is absolutely incapable of this. B. Yeltsin's power possesses a paradoxical feature: The stronger it is, the more its sphere of operation narrows. Today it hardly extends much further than the Kremlin wall. And the more energetically the West supports the bankrupt president, the more strongly will chaos and anarchy grow in the country, with all the ensuing consequences.

Objectively, the entire world, and first and foremost the West, is interested in restoring a strong union state on the territory of the USSR. However, narrow selfish class interests prevent it from understanding, and push it toward actions whose consequences are directly opposite to the expected results. This is called the "irony of history." And its action is irreversible. So is it worth continuing the hopeless and mortally dangerous attempts to outwit history?

Kozyrev To Visit Japan Before G-7 Meeting

OW0604154393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report on "exclusive" interview with Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, D. Voskoboynikov, Igor Porshnev, and others in Moscow on 6 April; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] At President Yeltsin's decision taken after his return from Vancouver, Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev will go to Japan for a working visit before the beginning of the special G-7 conference scheduled for April 14-15. The head of Russian diplomacy himself said so in an exclusive interview with Interfax's correspondent given on Tuesday [6 April] before his departure for Pakistan.

Before the latest Russian-American summit it was believed that Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov will attend the special G-7 conference in Tokyo together with the Deputy Premier and Finance Minister, Boris Fedorov. In his interview with Interfax Kozyrev commented on the changed circumstances as follows: "After the summit in Vancouver it became clear that the conference in Tokyo will involve all the G-7 foreign ministers, and that not only economic, but also political matters will be under discussion. Moreover, the G-7 believes that a political decision on interaction with Russia will be required. In this case economics follow politics. Secondly, there is a number of urgent international issues, such as the developments in Yugoslavia and in other 'hot spots', which need to be discussed more broadly. The G-7 conference, particularly with our participation, will acquire the nature of a forum for considering international problems. The third circumstance is the development of our relations with Japan itself, particularly the fact that Japan's leadership took a very clear stand concerning support for reforms in Russia".

As Kozyrev stressed, "We paid attention to the recent statement by Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa, which was made, in the first place, in support of Russia's government and president, secondly, in favor of promoting Russian-Japanese relations, and, thirdly, to indicate the absence of any linkage between the G-7 meetings (both in April and in July with Yeltsin's participation) and bilateral questions". "This is the approach we view as the most productive," the foreign minister said. "It reflects the need to 'separate' the bilateral agenda from that of the G-7, however not for the purpose of 'pushing' Russian-Japanese relations aside, but with a view to giving them an independent impetus without any linkage to irrelevant issues. That is why the president decided that I should not only participate in the special G-7 conference, but also go to Japan for a working visit prior to that".

According to Kozyrev, a date for his arrival in Tokyo has not been fixed yet. Nevertheless he proclaimed his desire to meet with Japan's foreign minister, "if a new minister is appointed by that time", and with Prime Minister Miyazawa. In comments on the resignation of the former head of Japanese diplomacy Kozyrev said: "I would like to use this opportunity to express my respect to Mr. Watanabe. Sometimes, despite his poor health, he made very long journeys; he was devoted to the cause of Russian-Japanese cooperation. I'm looking forward to meeting the man who will be my new colleague, and Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa, to discuss bilateral relations, since President Yeltsin's visit to Japan has not been removed from the agenda, but only postponed. There is a need to work out a bilateral agenda." Kozyrev found it necessary to point out that lately he got convinced "once again" that the Japanese government's policy toward Russia had "very solid political foundations". According to him, the fact that the issues of bilateral relations are not linked to the G-7 conferences "uplifts Japan in the eyes of the entire world and shows that Russian-Japanese relations, as a separate, independent direction, acquire additional maturity."

Foreign Minister Kozyrev Pays Visit to Pakistan

Seeks 'Good Neighborly Belt'

OW0604154993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report on "exclusive" interview with Foreign Minster Andrey Kozyrev by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, D. Voskoboynikov, Igor Porshnev, and others in Moscow on 6 April; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev of Russia, who flew to Pakistan Tuesday [6 April] for an official visit there, intends to "complete the work, started in Iran, of setting up a good neighborly belt around Russia." He told this to an INTERFAX corespondent in an exclusive interview before his flight to Islamabad. Kozyrev had paid an official visit to Iran a few days before the Russo-American summit in Vancouver.

The minister said that the relations with Pakistan and Iran had been "unjustifiably neglected" since as long ago as the Soviet times. "In point of fact, such contacts were inexistent for decades," he emphasized. Things have begun to change, he said. "We are establishing a very high level of relations," the foreign minister added.

From Pakistan Kozyrev will go on to Central Asian republics of the former USSR. He described his objective on that trip as "setting up a good neighborly belt in the CIS and a kind of 'peaceful encirclement' around Tajikistan at its request and with consent of its leaders." The minister said that this kind of a "peaceful isolation" was essential to "create a maximally favorable climate for helping Tajikistan, within the CIS framework, in overcoming the political crisis."

To Initial Document

LD0604125793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1135 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 6 Apr—Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev left this afternoon for an official visit to Pakistan. [passage omitted]

In Islamabad the sides are scheduled to initial a document on the bases of mutual relations between the two states; the document will be signed during the forthcoming visit to Moscow of Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. Immediately after ending his visit to Pakistan, Andrey Kozyrev will visit three Central Asian CIS republics—Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

Arrives in Islamabad

LD0604204493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2023 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Georgiy Shmelyev]

[Text] Islamabad April 6 TASS—Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev arrived in the Pakistani capital tonight on an official visit.

The program of his stay includes negotiations with Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif and Foreign Minister Mohammad Siddique Khan Kanjoo on aspects of the Russian-Pakistani relations.

The Russian side intends to confirm its readiness for the development of comprehensive relations and cooperation with Pakistan, exchange opinion on a number of international and regional issues, paying special attention to the situation around Tajikistan and Afghanistan. Andrey Kozyrev will be received by Pakistani President Ghulam Ishaq Khan.

"We attach special importance to the development of mutually beneficial and partner relations with Pakistan," Kozyrev told ITAR-TASS at the Islamabad airport.

"In Islamabad we plan to coordinate a document to determine bilateral cooperation areas. Much attention will be paid to bilateral relations, the situation in CIS Central Asian Republics and the Central Asian region in general. Both states are interested in stability and safety in the region.

"We also plan to discuss so acute a question as the fate of our POWs in Afghanistan. We appreciate Pakistani cooperation and assistance in solution to this problem. We hope to find a common language and work together to solve the issue," said the Russian official.

Foreign Ministry's Yastrzhembskiy Briefs Journalists

Kozyrev Message on CIS Armed Conflicts

LD0604141393 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] We will now turn to a briefing for Russian and foreign journalists on current issues of international politics held today at the press center of the Russian Foreign Ministry. Here is an excerpt from what Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of the Russian Foreign Ministry's Information and Press Department, said at the briefing.

[Begin Yastrzhembskiy recording] At the end of March, Russian Federation Foreign Minister Kozyrev sent a message to foreign ministers of the CIS countries, Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Moldova. It deals with an issue of deep concern to the whole civilized world, i.e. with the ruinous effect of armed conflicts on the humanitarian sphere. The Russian minister points out that armed conflicts have spread through a large part of the territory of the former Soviet Union. They bring with them huge casualties, caused primarily by a wide-scale use of so-called nonselective action weapons, namely aerial bombs, anti-personnel mines, missiles and artillery, incendiary devices, and multiple rocket launchers. These weapons kill civilians and destroy civilian installations.

Scorched-earth tactics are being used in armed conflicts on the territory of the former Soviet Union, the minister's message says, whereby property and vital facilities are being destroyed just for the sake of deterrence or out of vengeance. Kozyrev emphasizes that the new and democratic Russia, having proclaimed protection of human rights as a priority in its foreign policy, cannot tolerate this situation. As a participant of the Geneva convention on the protection of victims of war, Russia has a direct duty to do its utmost to ensure that all the warring sides observe the norms of humanitarian law. Those guilty of gross violations should be regarded as war criminals, with all the ensuing consequences.

Russia insistently calls on the Commonwealth states and on the countries participating in the work of CIS bodies as observers to take upon themselves international commitments in accordance with relevant international conventions. For this purpose, it proposes to sign at the Council of Heads of States on 30 April an agreement, open to other countries, on priority measures aimed at protecting victims of armed conflicts, and to ensure that it comes into effect as soon as possible. [end recording]

Dialogue With Turkey on Karabakh

LD0604131093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1246 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—Russia is maintaining a constant dialogue with Turkish representatives on the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of the information and press department of the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry, told a briefing today. The diplomat did not rule out the possibility that Moscow and Ankara might come up with a joint initiative on this question.

Referring to talks on this subject at the Russo-American summit in Vancouver, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy noted that the problem had been examined with a view to harmonizing the positions of the sides and seeking ways of bringing about the earliest possible cessation of hostilities in Nagorno-Karabakh. This, he said, is the starting point for any moves toward a political settlement of the crisis. The diplomat stressed that the recent escalation of hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh had resulted in deadlock at the talks that were being held in the framework of the Minsk initiative.

Concern Over UN Staff's Security

LD0604140693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1344 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The security of the U.N. forces and personnel in conditions when this organisation is being involved increasingly deeper in the settlement of crises in the world's flashpoints is of particular importance and urgency, a senior Russian spokesman said today, commenting on the special statement by the U.N. Security Council president adopted at its session on March 31.

Moscow regards this statement as an important signal of the Security Council's readiness to shore up with its prestige U.N. efforts to maintain peace and international security, said Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of the Russian Foreign Ministry's Information and Press Department.

Russia perceives cases of violence against U.N. representatives who take part in peace-keeping operations, which have become more frequent lately, also from the point of view that its contingent is part of the U.N. force on the territory of former Yugoslavia and its representatives and personnel participate in a whole number of U.N. peace-keeping actions.

Russia will continue to stand on the firm position in the issue of protecting the U.N. personnel and take part in making pertinent decisions, Yastrzhembskiy said.

Yugoslav Situation Discussed

LD0604143093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1418 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Staroselskiy and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The problem of the Yugoslav settlement was discussed in detail at the Russo-American summit in Vancouver, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of Russia's Department of Information and the Press, told a briefing on Tuesday.

Yastrzhembskiy assessed the exchange of opinions of the matter as useful. He said the Russian side can shortly take extra steps to find a more direct and effective road to settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Yastrzhembskiy did not rule out the possibility of Vitaliy Churkin, special representative of the Russian president, visiting Belgrade.

In the present conditions it is extremely important that the ceasefire in Bosnia and Herzegovina continue, Yastrzhembskiy said. Moscow is anxious over reports about violations of the agreement by Moslem forces and Croatian units in the area of Sarajevo and at various sections of the Herzegovina front.

Yastrzhembskiy said there is an impression in the Russian capital that the extremist forces, above all Moslem units, deliberately provoke the resumption of broad military operations. Moscow is also concerned over the situation with the evacuation of civilian Moslem population from Srebrenica. The Russian Foreign Ministry has the information that Serbs have fulfilled all their obligations and have ensured the unobstructed passage for the civilian population. But Moslem commanders have interfered.

Yastrzhembskiy said that the foreign media have unobjectively covered the decision of the parliament of Bosnian Serbs on the Vance-Owen plan. He believes the parliament's decision does not mean that Bosnian Serbs flatly refuse from the settlement on the basis of the plan. A Russian representative was present at the parliament meeting and arrived at the conclusion that the Bosnian Serbs have not rejected the plan. It is only that they have not yet accepted it fully. They called for the continuation of direct talks between the parties involved in the conflict.

Yastrzhembskiy said that this shows a positive effect of Russian diplomacy on the settlement process.

Russian Plane Shot at in Angola

LD0604160893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1543 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A Russian AN-32 plane, chartered by the U.N. World Food Program and piloted by a Russian crew, was put under UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] fire at the Uige city airport on April 5, head of the Russian Foreign Ministry's Information and Press Department Sergey Yastrzhembskiy told a briefing here today.

The damaged plane, which delivered humanitarian aid to residents of the Uige province, landed at the Luanda airport. Its flight engineer was gravely wounded.

The Russian Foreign Ministry resolutely denounces the UNITA actions, which endangered the life of Russian citizens, said Sergey Yastrzhembskiy. The ministry demands efficient measures to prevent similar incidents in future.

Talks Begin With Georgian Delegation in Sochi

LD0604181793 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1530 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by correspondent Arkadiy Makanyan from Sochi—live]

[Text] Good evening. I have just returned from the Zhemchuzhina Hotel, where talks are taking place between a Russian Government delegation headed by Defense Minister Pavel Grachev and a Georgian delegation headed by the republic's Prime Minister Tenghiz Sigua.

As is known, these talks have arisen because of the mutual interests of the two states in many major problems. At the very outset of the meeting, having briefly described the political and economic situation in Russia, Grachev said that Russia is attaching great importance to the preservation and development of good relations with Georgia.

Grachev said: Our position is immutable, and it is the preservation of Georgia's territorial integrity and effective guarantees for the autonomy of the Abkhazian and South Ossetian populations. Russia is alarmed at the present worsening of relations between the two states. We are worried by the daily attacks on Russian servicemen, the death of people, and the thefts of property. At the same, there is no end to the flow of accusations against Russia, that it is interfering in internal conflicts and that it has as its intention—as some Georgian mass media and some others claim—to allegedly force Georgia to its knees.

Grachev said: This is not true. Russia has never had and will not have such aspirations. Such accusations are unfounded. He remarked that such unfounded attacks can only be regretted because they are whipping up tension and are worsening the atmosphere in which the real problems that exist must be resolved. We have come here to outline constructive ways of resolving our relations with Georgia, Grachev said. We believe that the root of the evil is the fact that the Abkhaz problem has not been settled. We want to stress that it is necessary to find mutually acceptable solutions and are prepared to assist in this for however long it takes, specifically here in Sochi.

Russia is advocating an immediate cease-fire and the search for a solution at the negotiating table. Here, one must, as before, direct one's attention toward the main provisions of the final document of the 3 September 1992 Moscow meeting. A so-called cooling-off period is necessary for its implementation.

In his speech Sigua said in reply that he sees in this meeting a manifestation of goodwill from both sides. Referring to the need to search for a peaceful solution to the situation that has arisen, Sigua noted that, as much as possible, both sides are obliged to remove all the barriers that are being created on the path of a settlement of mutual relations between Russia and Georgia.

Sigua also agreed that the Abkhaz conflict is the main issue. Then, on behalf of his delegation, the prime minister said that they are ready, right now, to sit at the negotiating table. In his view, however, the remaining sides—which signed the well-known agreement in Moscow—are violating its conditions.

Today is the first day of talks, which are difficult in many respects because of the divergence of positions on some major problems. Work will be continued tomorrow in separate groups. This meeting is to draw up specific material for talks to be held afterwards between Yeltsin and Shevardnadze.

Grachev Details Moscow's Position

OW0604173793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1706 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Pavel Grachev, Russian Defense Minister, says that the Russian negotiating team does not propose to "impose its will" at the talks with Georgia which are to start in Sochi late on April 6. Still, Russia "has a right to and must" suggest its solutions to problems without interfering into Georgia's internal affairs, he emphasized.

Talking to journalists in Sochi Grachev, who heads the Russian delegation, said that the Russian position "makes no discriminatory demands. ... We have been recognizing Georgia as a united states which incorporates South Ossetia, Abkhazia, and Adzharia but we support a federative structure of Georgia with an autonomy status for these states as done in Russia."

Grachev said that bilateral financial and economic issues cannot be resolved and a friendship and cooperation treaty cannot be signed with Georgia unless the bloodshed in Abkhazia is stopped.

The minister does not think that an understanding will be easy to find on military issues "because the conflict has grown into a civil war." Attempts are made, he said, to drag Russian armed forces into that war. "They are perfectly neutral," he emphasized and added that he is prepared to prove this in the course of the negotiations.

Grachev said that the Sochi meeting, which had been requested by Eduard Shevardnadze, the Georgian leader, will discuss the situation around the Russian army units in Abkhazia and economic and financial cooperation between Georgia and Russia pursuant to a bilateral friendship and cooperation treaty.

The Russian team, said Grachev, on which all ministries directly interested in improving the relations with Georgia are represented such as Foreign, Economics, Industry, and Finance and the State Property Committee, "is empowered to discuss all issues and work out drafts for the leaders of the two countries to adopt at their possible meeting." The Russian minister said that the talks are scheduled to start and 6:30 p.m. with a plenary session which will be attended by news media.

The next day three subcommittees will meet. That of defense officials will discuss the status of the Russian army units in Georgia, in particular Abkhazia; another, made of foreign service and defense officials will try to draft a friendship and cooperation treaty for the presidents of the two countries to sign; the third subcommittee in which the Russian side will be headed by a deputy economics minister will work on economic and financial matters and also on human rights in Georgia.

On April 8 a plenary session will summarize the outcome of the talks.

On top of that, Grachev noted, he will, as suggested by the Georgian leader, spend an hour or two in Georgia April 8 or 9 discussing with Shevardnadze the bilateral relations.

"That trip, Grachev noted, will become possible provided that all the above problems are resolved at the talks."

Grachev on 'Dismembering' Georgia

OW0604200293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1925 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia had never dreamed of dismembering Georgia. Moscow is standing by its position that Georgia must remain an entity with effective autonomy guaranteed to the Abkhazian, South Ossetian, and Adzharian populations. Pavel Grachev, Russia's Defense Minister, made this statement on the first day of Russo- Georgian talks in the Sochi Zhemchuzhina (Pearl) hotel.

He believes the "stumbling block" in Russo-Georgian relations to be the continuing Georgian-Abkhazian war. Russia, Grachev insisted, wants an immediate ceasefire and negotiations to resolve the conflict.

The minister confirmed that the Russian troops stationed in the war zone "are ordered to stay neutral - and they do just that." On the other hand, Grachev said, they will return fire if attacked.

The defense minister emphasized that in looking for ways to stop the bloodshed in Abkhazia the warring parties must be guided by the main provisions of the Moscow agreement signed September 3, 1992. On the other hand, Grachev thinks that the document needs "a significant amount of updating." "We would agree, the minister noted, to the UN and the CSCE playing a more active role in resolving the Abkhazian conflict. What we do object to is that in such proposals Russia is regarded as a party in the conflict rather than as a mediator and is, for practical purposes, removed from the negotiating process." He said that a political alliance of Russia and Georgia is hardly possible as long as the war is continuing in Abkhazia but "the economic integration must be restored." He admitted, however, that improvement of economic ties "would not be understood by the Russian public." The agenda of the bilateral talks, Grachev said, includes the status of the Russian troops in Georgia and the boundary problems. The minister believes that the pull out of Russian troops from Georgia "cannot be settled overnight and must be decided on by the two governments." There is "no question" of immediate withdrawal from Abkhazia "and I will not broach that subject." The minister said he is prepared to meet with Eduard Shevardnadze, the Georgian leader, anywhere any time.

The talks will be continued at 10:00 a.m. local time in subcommittees on military, political, and economic issues. All hostilities must cease for the duration of the talks. Minister Grachev said that he would ask the Abkhazian leaders to order a ceasefire.

Government To Demand Russian Troop Withdrawal

OW0604104793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1026 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Georgian Prime Minister Tenghiz Sigua stated that Georgia's position on the Abkhazian issue during the Russian-Georgian talks, to begin in the afternoon April 6, is absolutely clear: Russian troops must be immediately withdrawn from Abkhazia.

Sigua told the Georgian parliament on Tuesday [6 April] morning that Georgia was aware that the Russian air units cannot be withdrawn from Gudauta quickly, so it will demand the immediate withdrawal of the Russian units from the village of Nizhnaya Esheri near Sukhumi and from the area of the Sukhumi beacon. Sigua also said that the Georgian delegation will insist on the adoption of a schedule of the Russian troops' withdrawal from Georgia which must be finished by the end of 1995.

To quote Sigua, during the talks in Sochi, which are expected to end on April 8, in addition to the problem of settling the Abkhazian conflict, the two parties will discuss trade and economic issues. There are practically no disagreements on the final provision of the agreement, said Sigua. He noted, however, that if no accord is achieved on the first question, the talks may be cut short.

Cease-Fire in Place

LD0704084893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0755 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondents Andrey Naryshkin and Irina Shchegoleva]

[Text] Sochi, 7 Apr—The main outcome of the first day of the Russian-Georgian talks which began in Sochi on Tuesday [6 April] has been the stabilization of the situation on the dividing line between Georgian and Abkhaz troops. Colonel General Aleksandr Galkin, a member of the Russian military delegation, told the ITAR- TASS correspondent today that firing ceased on 6 April at about 2000 [1600 GMT]. The moratorium, announced at the proposal of the Russian delegation following talks with Abkhaz leaders, is being implemented by all sides.

The second day of work by the Russian and Georgian Government delegations began with a tete-a-tete between Pavel Grachev and Tengiz Sigua. During the second half of the day the participants in the talks will start work in sections. On the meeting's agenda is a broad range of military and political matters, including a peace settlement in Abkhazia, the status of Russian troops in Georgia, and clarification on the map of the administrative territorial border line between Russia and Georgia.

According to Colonel General Aleksandr Galkin, chief of the Main Armored Tank Directorate of the Russian Defense Ministry who is heading the work of the Russian military section, draft treaties between Russia and Georgia have essentially already been prepared but the normalization of the situation in Abkhazia remains the main condition for them to be initialled.

Grachev Comments on First Session

LD0704101693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0925 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Andrey Naryshkin and Irina Shchegoleva]

[Text] Sochi, 7 Apr—"We have some good ideas developing, but we need to hear the views of servicemen on one side and the other," Army General Pavel Grachev, head of the Russian Government delegation, told journalists today after his morning meeting with Tengiz Sigua at Sochi's "Zhemchuzhina" Hotel. For his part, the Georgian prime minister said that he was "very satisfied with the conversation."

The leaders of the delegations headed a joint sitting of military and diplomatic sections which began at 0730 GMT behind closed doors. The success of the talks as a whole depends to a great extent on whether a compromise is reached at this sitting.

"One of the main terms for a settlement of the Georgian-Abkhaz conflict is the withdrawal of all Russian troops from the territory of Abkhazia," Aleksandr Kavsadze, chairman of the Georgian Government Committee for Human Rights and Interethnic Relations, told the ITAR-TASS correspondent. "If agreements are reached on the withdrawal of Russian military formations from Eshera, Gudauta, and Sukhumi, then a peaceful settlement of the conflict will become a reality."

It may become known today whether the Russian leadership will agree to such steps.

Grachev May Meet Shevardnadze in Tbilisi 9 Apr

AU0704103093 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0800 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Text] As we have informed you, Georgian-Russian Government talks began in Sochi yesterday.

Yesterday's talks were held in an extremely good-natured atmosphere. All military actions are to be halted in Abkhazia during the duration of the talks. Pavel Grachev and Tengiz Kitovani have issued the appropriate orders in connection with this. Pavel Grachev also pointed out that he would personally speak with Vladislav Ardzinba regarding a cease-fire.

Batoni [Georgian polite form of address] Jaba Ioseliani handed to Pavel Grachev an official invitation from Batoni Eduard Shevardnadze to visit Tbilisi. In this respect, Grachev stated that, if they manage to resolve all the questions by 8 April, he personally, along with other delegation members, would fly to Tbilisi on 9 April to meet Batoni Eduard Shevardnadze. The Defense Minister said: I want everyone to know that I have a very friendly attitude toward Georgia and good intentions and will do everything so that the conflict in Abkhazia can end peacefully.

Today, the Georgian-Russian Government delegations are continuing their work. We would like to believe that these very responsible talks that are vitally important for us will end positively. The information received this morning from Abkhazia gives us grounds for thinking this might be so.

No Agreement Yet

LD0704105993 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Report by unidentified correspondent in Sochi; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A working meeting of the Russian and Georgian delegations held in Sochi this morning has just ended. It will continue at 1500 [1100 GMT]. In the opinion of Sigua, head of the Georgian delegation, the sides have failed to reach any agreements. It is too early, however, to talk about the breeching of the [cease-fire] agreement. The Georgian side has proposed to Pavel Grachev that the Russian laboratory in Nizhniye Eshery be moved out. For its part, the Russian side declares the territory next to the laboratory a neutral zone and refrains from withdrawing its troops from the area. This was the opinion of the Georgian side. In the words of Pavel Grachev, head of the Russian delegation, the talks are proving difficult. At the same time the sides managed to agree on forming a demilitarized corridor between the Georgian and Abkhazian sides. An accord has also been signed on setting up a seismic laboratory in Eshery. After the morning meeting, the sides have also discussed ways of guarding railways and Russian troops' stay in Georgia. They are to remain there until 1995.

Grachev: Russian Troops To Stay Until 1995

LD0704120293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1152 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Andrey Naryshkin and Irina Schegoleva]

[Text] Sochi April 7 TASS—Russia and Georgia agreed on Wednesday that Russian troops will remain in the former Soviet republic until 1995 and that the warring Georgian and Abkhazian forces will be disengaged by a three-kilometre wide corridor.

"We have definitely agreed with (Georgian Prime Minister Tengiz) Sigua that our troops will stay in Georgia, including Abkhazia, until 1995", Russian Defence Minister Pavel Grachev told reporters on Wednesday during a break in Russian-Georgian talks.

He added that the sides also agreed that the warring forces in Abkhazia are to be disengaged by a three-kilometre wide corridor and that the railway stretch going via Georgia from the Russian city of Adler to the Armenian capital of Yerevan is to be guarded.

However, Russia and Georgia stumbled over the Russian seismic laboratory laboratory and the adjoining territory should be proclaimed a closed zone and that barricades should be put around it, they stumbled over the presence of Russian troops there.

"The Georgian side wants our troops to withdraw from there. We insist that the troops stay there", Grachev said.

According to Sigua the major results of the meeting can be a framework political agreement, as well as agreements on military, economic, interbank, financial and other issues.

All the documents have been discussed and are being improved now. "I think that today or tomorrow they will be ready to such an extent that will allow to hold a Russian-Georgian summit", Sigua said.

Grachev added that the military commission at the negotiations will start discussing an immediate ceasefire in Abkhazia later in the day.

Official Explains Use of Black Sea Ships for Abkhazia Evacuation

OW0604160193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, D. Voskoboinikov, Igor Porshnev, and others; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia did not discuss with Ukraine the operation for evacuating refugees from the area of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict by Black Sea Fleet ships, since Kiev's negative reaction was known in advance, a high-ranking official from Russia's Naval Headquarters told Interfax on Tuesday [6 April]. According to him, Russia simply had no choice. "We could hardly send ships from the Northern or the Pacific Fleet there. The problem required quick solution," he said.

Interfax's interviewee described as "very odd" the recent statement of Ukraine's Defence Ministry, which expressed "concern about the use of Black Sea Fleet ships with Ukrainian crews for unclear tasks in the area of the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict on orders from Moscow".

An exclusively humanitarian task, to evacuate refugees, was set before the Black Sea Fleet ships, which did not even carry weapons on their board, the official stressed. "It isn't clear what 'Ukrainian crews' meant either. Under the agreements reached by Presidents Boris Yeltsin and Leonid Kravchuk in Yalta, all Black Sea Fleet ships are manned by Russian and Ukrainian recruits on the basis of parity." According to the naval official, "Kiev's policy toward the Black Sea Fleet is based on the following principle: "everything located on my territory is mine". [quotation marks as received] He referred, by way of an example, to the situation concerning a floating dockyard built in the Ukrainian city of Nikolayev for a plant in the Russian city of Vladivostok, when the Soviet Union still existed. "Vladivostok paid for the construction of the dockyard in full, while Ukraine invested not a single kopeck in the project. Now Ukraine is preventing the dockyard from being despatched to Vladivostok on the same principle: 'grab, no matter what happens next'", he said.

News Briefing Held on Ukrainian Nuclear Weapons

PM0604181193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 93 pp 1, 3

[Oleg Vladykin report: "Do Not Set a Dangerous Precedent. Question of Siting Nuclear Weapons on Ukrainian Territory"]

[Text] A news conference for Russian and foreign journalists was held in Moscow on Monday 5 April in connection with the Russian Government statement on the question of the siting of nuclear weapons on Ukrainian territory. Opening this conference, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Grigoriy Berdennikov said that the talks with Ukraine on the problems of the latter's subscribing to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as a nuclear-free state and its ratifying the START I Treaty have not hitherto borne any fruit. This is accordingly giving rise to concern, as reflected in the published statement, since it may set a dangerous precedent. If another nuclear state emerges, the whole nuclear nonproliferation regime may be placed in jeopardy.

Ambassador at Large Yuriy Dubinin, head of the Russian state delegation at the talks with Ukraine, drew journalists' attention to the Russian Federation's readiness to perform all the tasks of keeping the nuclear weapons safe in their current locations on the territory of the former union republics. According to him, the Ukrainian side was handed the draft of the relevant agreement. This speaks in particular of ensuring warranty and manufacturer's inspection of missile system maintenance [garantiyniy i avtorskiy kontrol za ekspluatatsiyey raketnykh kompleksov]. What is more, in order to remove all concern over nuclear weapons, the Russian delegation has proposed detaching [otstykovat] the nose sections of the missiles sited on Ukrainian territory within a very short period and bringing all nuclear munitions to Russia for subsequent destruction.

Colonel General Boris Gromov, Russian Federation deputy defense minister, who spoke at the press conference, stressed that despite statements regarding its nonnuclear status the Ukrainian leadership is taking practical steps that attest to Ukraine's desire to possess nuclear weapons. In particular, he pointed out, the Ukrainian president's edict No. 209 of 5 April 1992, followed by an order issued by the Ukrainian defense minister, incorporated the 43d Missile and 46th Air Armies (176 missile launchers and 43 strategic bombers) in the Ukrainian Armed Forces. In May 1992 the personnel of two nuclear-technical troop units of the 46th Air Army, where roughly 670 strategic nuclear munitions are stationed, swore the Ukrainian military oath. All this indicates that control has effectively been established over these munitions and the Ukrainian side has begun handling them [nachata ikh ekspluatatsiya]. What is more, the subunits guarding the missile systems are being manned solely by citizens of the republic. Ukraine has thus acquired an opportunity in principle to use nuclear weapons.

It is obvious, Boris Gromov said, that the Ukrainian side has no intention of totally eliminating the strategic arms on its territory within seven years as envisaged by the START I Treaty. The second round of talks saw the first outright reference to Ukrainian ownership of the nuclear weapons temporarily stationed on Ukrainian territory. It is thus no coincidence that this January a new staff structure emerged within the Ukrainian Armed Forces, a structure whose name speaks for itself—the Center for Administrative Command of the Strategic Nuclear Forces [Tsentr administrativnogo upravleniya voyskami strategicheskikh yadernykh sil].

Meanwhile, in response to journalists' questions, Col. Gen. Gromov cited as guarantees against the unauthorized use of nuclear weapons the centralized command of these weapons—not by two or more, but one "master"—and the ordinary common sense displayed by the people directly effecting this command. These guarantees are still in existence today in Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine, Although the situation is very tricky.

Neglected Nuclear Weapons in Ukraine Pose Danger

PM0704085193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Apr 93 First Edition p 5

[Viktor Litovkin report: "Nuclear Warheads in Ukraine Pose Danger"]

[Text] Relations between Ukraine and Russia have again worsened over the nuclear weapons sited on Ukrainian territory. The Russian Government statement issued Monday is evidence of that.

However, the real technical condition of the nuclear munitions on Ukrainian territory is indeed causing specialists entirely justified concern. Scheduled maintenance of nuclear charges is more than 10 months overdue here. These charges are being kept in dumps alongside warheads from strategic ballistic missiles. The concentration of assemblies [bloki] and warheads in one building is more than seven times the norm.

All this not only drastically increases the background radiation in the arsenals, but can also, specialists claim, cause nuclear munitions to end up in an uncontrollable state and may result in emergencies and an unauthorized explosion. They claim that such an explosion may not necessarily be a nuclear explosion, but, in terms of its consequences in the form of the dispersal of fissionable material—weapons-grade plutonium, uranium—and the radioactive contamination of soil and water, it may indeed be comparable to the results of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

This must not be used to scare people, it is simply necessary to be aware of it. There are roughly 1,200 nuclear warhead assemblies [yadernyye bloki] for strategic missiles on Ukrainian territory and more than 600 air-launched cruise missile warhead assemblies. According to the information at our disposal, 446 strategic missile warhead assemblies and 162 cruise missiles did not have the necessary chemical components guaranteeing their total nuclear safety changed during 1992 or the first three months of 1993.

Nuclear specialists describe these components as absorbents, which act as filters to neutralize the gases given off by the nuclear charges during protracted storage, impede the formation of combustible compounds in them, and thus prevent emergencies from arising.

Ukraine does not produce these components. What is more, its specialists do not have the legal right to dismantle and assemble these munitions or change particular components in them since the republic is not a nuclear power and cannot authorize its citizens to carry out this work.

At the same time Russia too, which does possess these components, effectively does not have the legal right to change them. Ukraine has declared the nuclear warheads to be its property. For Russian specialists to carry out any work on these warheads means acknowledging Ukraine to be a nuclear power and backing its decision, and this constitutes a most flagrant breach of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, of which Russia is a depositary.

So we have a juridical deadlock and a legal moot point which the leaders of the Ukrainian Defense Ministry brought upon themselves and others by announcing the creation of the Center for the Control of Strategic Nuclear Forces and virtually placing all nuclear-technical bases under their own command.

"The nuclear munitions sited in Ukraine do not in fact have a real owner today," I was told at a Russian Defense Ministry main directorate. "There is no one to call anyone to account for their safety and good technical condition and no one to be called to account."

Two rounds of talks between government delegations from the two countries held on Russia's initiative in order to ensure proper care of nuclear weapons and their technical security have ended in failure. The Ukrainian side is insisting that these weapons belong to Ukraine and is refusing to allow the Russian side the necessary opportunities to carry out guaranteed maintenance on the nuclear warheads.

The Ukrainian officials' statement regarding Russia's desire to deprive Ukraine of its right to compensation for the components of these weapons is totally unfounded, I was told by Colonel General Yevgeniy Maslin, one of the participants in the intergovernmental talks and head of a Russian Defense Ministry main directorate. They are well aware that the communique signed by Presidents Kravchuk and Yeltsin says that these components are to be processed for use as fuel for Ukrainian nuclear power stations. And Russia is ready to agree on that.

But while talks are under way, how can the nuclear safety of the warhead assemblies on Ukrainian territory be ensured?

Col. Gen. Yevgeniy Maslin said that there may be various options here.

"First," the general said, "the nuclear munitions of long-range cruise missiles for heavy strategic bombers should be placed in a state of reduced combat readiness and taken to central factory gate bases for subsequent disassembly, as envisaged by the agreement between the two countries. Under Ukrainian supervision, moreover."

Second, he said, ballistic missile nose cones and their warhead assemblies should be taken to central factory gate bases for the same purpose—disassembly. That can be done within 18 months. And third—and perhaps most important—the targeting information [poletnyye zadaniya] should be removed from all nuclear weapon delivery vehicles in Ukraine and the world community secured against an unauthorized nuclear missile launch.

Other specialists think that if Ukraine does not want to remove these munitions before the question of reprocessing them as nuclear fuel for its nuclear power stations is resolved, it could have the option of transferring all the nuclear technical and missile technical support bases and arsenals to Russian jurisdiction. Russia could then take full responsibility for preserving the security of the dread weapons and make pledges regarding their material-technical, ecological, and financial maintenance throughout the duration of their temporary sojourn on Ukrainian territory.

Otherwise, they say, Ukraine must openly state that it is becoming a nuclear power and take full legal and technical responsibility for the nuclear safety of these weapons and for the other international legal consequences.

One thing alone must not be allowed: uncertainty as to which state the nuclear munitions belong. Experts joke bleakly that it is impossible to be "slightly pregnant." It is a question of either-or. One thing or the other.

Ukrainian Claims on Black Sea Fleet Repudiated

PM0604151993 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 3

[Report by Vladimir Maryukha: "The 'Cost' of the Black Sea Fleet"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Defense Ministry is making another attempt to scuttle the Yalta agreement on the Black Sea Fleet.

As we reported before (KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 April 1993), the Ukrainian Defense Ministry has put out a statement announcing its intention to elaborate proposals on suspending the Yalta agreement on the Black Sea Fleet. Vice Admiral Eduard Baltin, commander of the Black Sea Fleet, is accused of acting solely on orders from Moscow. But the presidents of the Russian Federation and Ukraine, who signed the agreement in Yalta, do not see the commander's actions as "criminal," since it applies to the day-to-day activities of the fleet, although the Ukrainian Defense Ministry clearly thinks differently. So the "marked card" which is used to play for Black Sea Fleet "stakes" has been brought out again: Who pays, and how much?

The Ukrainian Defense Ministry's attempt at the beginning of this year to finance the fleet through its own navy's financial service was unsuccessful. The intention to make the the Black Sea Fleet commander financially subordinate to the commander of the Ukrainian Navy was effectively thwarted. The option that involved doubling the pay of those who had taken the Ukrainian oath also failed. The Russian side sent a package of proposals to the Ukrainian Government on establishing common pay rates for all Black Sea Fleet servicemen and providing them with rubles for trips to CIS countries that have remained in the ruble zone. In April and May Black Sea Fleet seamen will receive Russian privatization checks, irrespective of what oath they have taken. There is simply no other "Moscow interference" in the affairs of the Black Sea Fleet.

The Ukrainian Defense Ministry is also losing its stake on claiming to shoulder the bulk of the financial expenditure on the upkeep of the Black Sea Fleet. According to the Navy Press Center, last year Ukraine spent 9 billion karbovanets coupons. But Russia spent 3 billion rubles [R], which carry more weight than the Ukrainian currency, on supplies of various military equipment. Another R2 billion were spent on providing for the daily life of the fleet, to which one must add a considerable sum of foreign currency to pay for Black Sea Fleet seamen's foreign voyages.

According to the preliminary figures, in the first quarter of this year Ukraine allocated 10 billion karbovantsy and Russia allocated R4 billion. In view of the different exchange rates it is clear that the Black Sea Fleet is equally expensive, in the literal and figurative senses, for Ukraine and for Russia.

Defense Ministry Denies Role in Armenian-Azerbaijani Fighting

OW0604202793 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1927 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's Defense Ministry has rejected an assertion of Azerbaijan's plenipotentiary representative to Moscow Hikmet Gadzhizade stating that the 7th Russian Army is participating in the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in support of the Armenians. A message of the Russian Defense Ministry's press center distributed on Tuesday [6 April] in Moscow notes that "there is no 7th Russian Army in Armenia as it has been disbanded." Only the 127th Motor Rifle Division has remained in the city of Kumayri (in the east of Armenia, near the Turkish border) as it was envisaged by a treaty between Armenia and Russia. "Units of this division have not participated and are not participating in any hostilities," the press center's message emphasizes.

In his interview with Interfax on Tuesday Valeriy Babkin, the commander of the 127th division, qualified the reports of the Azerbaijani sources on participation of the Russian forces in the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict as "provocative." According to Babkin, Russian servicemen just help to form Armenia's army.

For his part, Serzh Sarkisiian, chairman of self-defense committee of the Nagorno-Karabakh republic, declared to Interfax that "there are not even two dozen Russians in Karabakh fighting on the side of the Armenian forces."

Churkin Flies to Belgrade for Bosnia-Herzegovina Talks

OW0704112993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1021 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Wednesday morning, the Russian president's special envoy, Deputy Foreign Minister Vitaliy Churkin, flew to Belgrade. The Russian Foreign Ministry informed Interfax that the aim of the visit was to discuss ways of achieving a peaceful settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina with the Yugoslav leaders.

The high-ranking Russian diplomat may also meet with leader of the Bosnian Serbs Radovan Karazic.

Following his discussions with the Serbian leaders, Churkin may travel to New York for talks with the co-chairmen of the Geneva Conference on a settlement in former Yugoslavia and with the U.S. president's special envoy Reginald Bartholomew.

NATO Action on Bosnia Condemned; Grachev Role Questioned

PM0604152393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 3

[Vladimir Peresada report: "Interference: Unprecedented NATO Military Action in Balkans"]

[Excerpts] Brussels, 5 Apr—A decision has been made at NATO headquarters in Brussels to send warplanes to the Yugoslav crisis region. NATO aviation "is to enforce the ban on flights in the airspace over Bosnia and Herzegovina," which, as is well known, was initially established arbitrarily by the Western powers and then sanctioned by the United Nations.

As formal justification NATO is using the recent UN Security Council resolution on the possible use of force to ensure observance of this ban. However, it is no secret that the North Atlantic alliance began preparing for the use of military means to "maintain peace in former Yugoslavia" several months ago. All that was missing was the necessary cover, which now exists.

Thus the Western bloc is taking the path of direct armed interference in the Yugoslav crisis. Furthermore, this operation will be the first military action in the entire history of the alliance, which was created in 1949, just as it will be NATO's first sortie beyond its zone of responsibility, which the NATO leadership has repeatedly promised it would not overstep under any circumstances. [passage omitted]

It is typical that this decision was made a few days after a meeting in Brussels of the defense ministers of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council member countries (the states of NATO, Eastern Europe, the Baltic, and the CIS). Russian Defense Minister P. Grachev took part in it and also had meetings with [NATO Secretary General] Woerner and General Shalikashvili, commander in chief of the NATO Allied Armed Forces in Europe. Did they inform Grachev about the decision that was in preparation? If not it will be interesting to see Moscow's official reaction to the fact that the opinion of Russia as a "partner" was deliberately ignored. But if the answer is yes, another more serious question arises: Did the present Moscow leadership protest against NATO's unprecedented military action in Europe or give it its blessing?

Grachev Remarks on Baltic Pullout Said 'Own View'

MK0604134293 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 7, 6 Apr 93 (signed to press 5 Apr) p 4

[Pavel Felgengauer report under the rubric "Information": Russian Troops in Baltic Countries"]

[Text] The number of Russian troops in the Baltics is comparatively small, but their accelerated withdrawal is unlikely. The forces in the Baltics receive almost no draftees for reinforcement; thus those who stay on are almost entirely career servicemen burdened with wives and children whose numbers are considerably in excess of the combat personnel on the roll call. They all would need housing but the number of officers with no accommodation is growing steadily as it is, owing to the accelerated withdrawal of forces from other regions. Besides, the shortage of the rank and file slows down the dismantling of equipment and its shipment home.

Those that stay on in the Baltics are "heavy" units of limited mobility and extremely low fighting efficiency. All that was really needed in other regions and "hot spots" has been pulled out. Thus the reasons for General Grachev's tough talk in Brussels "on a halt to Russian troop withdrawal from the Baltics" are quite understandable. However, your SEGODNYA correspondent was told by a high-ranking government official in Moscow: "Gen. Grachev's statement is his own view. This question has not been looked into at the government level."

Shokhin Says Paris Club's Debt Rescheduling Helps Reforms

LD0604194593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1839 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Podyapolskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The rescheduling of the USSR's foreign debt creates a sturdy financial base for carrying on economic reforms in Russia, said Russian Deputy Prime Minister Aleksandr Shokhin. He spoke at a press conference today devoted to the results of the talks between the Russian delegation and the Paris Club of creditor nations on the problem of Russia's foreign debt.

As a result of these talks, participants signed an agreement to defer repayments on the former Soviet Union's debts for the ten-year period. Under this agreement, Russia's aggregate payments on the debt to the Paris Club will amount to two billion dollars in 1993, which in Shokhin's view will "ensure a respite for bringing about a financial stabilisation and for restructuring the Russian economy."

Representatives of the Paris Club took note that an agreement with the International Monetary Fund on the reserve credit has yet to be signed and agreed to postpone the conclusion of this agreement from April 1 to October 1, 1993.

Describing the terms for deferring repayments on the foreign debt as "unprecedented and unique" in world practice, Shokhin pointed out that the Paris Club by its stance gave backing to Russian reforms. "We now have enough time in our disposal to create, by the responsible economic policy, guarantees for implementing the agreement signed," Shokhin said.

Expects Agreement With IMF

OW0704015093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1928 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The restructuring of the former USSR's foreign debt by the Paris club of creditors is the first shot in the arm in 1993 for the Russian reforms, Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin said at a news conference Tuesday [6 April].

The creditors granted Russia a ten-year respite for paying $15 Bn [billion] out of the $17 Bn it was supposed to repay this year.

Shokhin was confident that an agreement with the International Monetary Fund would be signed before October 1.

He called for putting the activities of the Central Bank of Russia [CBR] under strict control, for the Bank's credit expansion acts as a "destructive factor" in the Russian economy. The vice premier said that if Russians support the reform in the April 25 referendum, the government will find it easier, in legal terms, to control the CBR.

Shokhin noted that at the Vancouver summit Russia stressed the need for such forms of economic support as the removal of discriminatory restrictions on Russian exports. He said that no specific agreements had been reached in this field. On the other hand, the U.S. was supportive of making U.S. markets accessible to Russia's high technologies.

Sees 'Breathing Space'

MK0704084293 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 10

[Natalya Kalashnikova report: "Russia and International Financial Organizations. Paris Club Grants Moscow Deferment"]

[Text] On 3 April the Paris Club finally made the long-awaited decision to restructure the USSR's foreign debt. In the opinion of Vice Premier Aleksandr Shokhin, representing Russia at the talks, although as a result there still "remain unrealized wishes," on the whole the "unique" restructuring conditions give Russia "breathing space." Now, instead of paying $17 billion in 1993, as previously demanded by creditors, Russia has been granted a 10-year debt-servicing deferment worth around $15 billion.

The Paris accord was the result of lengthy talks, as a result of which Western creditors made significant concessions. Back in December 1992 the Paris Club was offering a USSR debt-restructuring formula which, according to Shokhin, would have taken Russia to a $6.5 billion payment total in 1993 for all credits as a whole (not only to Paris Club members). Now Russia can count on the fact that the total will be halved (this will be ascertained finally after bilateral expert assessments with each creditor country have been made).

It was also possible to solve a number of technical problems at the session. First, after the USSR's disintegration a strange situation arose, whereby even many specialists could not clearly define where the USSR's debts ended and Russia's began. Various sums were eligible for restructuring depending on interpretation. Disputes arose (the fiercest ones were and are with Ukraine) about where exactly the credits received had been used—in Russia or other republics. According to Shokhin, a number of such problems have already been solved, and others will be solved during bilateral talks with creditors. Second, lately the reaching of an agreement with the Paris Club has hampered Ukraine's position. Now, according to Shokhin, this question "is temporarily closed": The West will not demand payments from Russia for the "Ukrainian part of the debts" until Russia agrees with Kiev. If Kiev nonetheless expresses its willingness and ability to participate in servicing the debt, it will obtain the right to 16 percent of the former USSR's foreign assets (but the right to the assets remains tied to servicing the debt).

Shokhin stressed that Russia has not requested that the USSR's debts be written off or that it be relieved of paying interest on them. Usually such a failure is accompanied by the declaration of a country as bankrupt, which entails a refusal to grant it new credits and the sequestration of foreign property (Russia's is valued at almost $300 billion) and export goods. In the vice premier's opinion, Russia is a long way from bankruptcy. First, the situation in the country, he said, is "not so sorry;" second, it is "in a position to get on its feet quickly;" third, "it does not want to look like a beggar with an outstretched hand," and civilized relations with creditors must be maintained. The vice premier expressed the hope that Russia would be able make half of its due payments no later than September. Under the agreement with the Paris Club, talks on 1994 payments will begin at the end of the year (taking account of the actual situation).

Nevertheless, restructuring the USSR's debt does not in itself solve all the economic problems of Russia, which is counting on being granted new credits. In particular, Vladimir Mashits, chairman of the State Committee for Economic Cooperation With CIS States, set off for talks with the IMF in Washington Sunday. It is expected that discussion will center on Russia's balance of payments (to date it has still not made its full contribution for admission to the IMF) and the agreement on unfreezing the $4 billion technical credit promised to Russia (of which $1 billion has so far been received). The G-7 countries, which would like to transfer part of the burden of giving Russia economic assistance to the IMF, are counting on the stepping up of cooperation between Russia and the IMF.

Russian, PRC Admirals See Prospects for Ties

LD0604133893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1254 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sergey Ostanin]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—The development of ties between the naval authorities of Russia and China were discussed today at a meeting between Admiral Feliks Gromov, commander of the Russian Navy, and Vice Admiral Zhang Lianzhong, commander of the Navy of the People's Liberation Army, who is visiting Moscow. The ITAR-TASS correspondent learned this at the press center of the Russian Navy. Admiral Feliks Gromov informed his Chinese guest of progress in the Navy's military reform and spoke in favor of expanding contacts with China's naval authorities. In his view, friendship between Russia and China is a stabilizing factor in the Pacific region and a good example of fruitful cooperation between the two countries. "The aim of my visit, the Chinese military official said at the meeting, is to familiarize myself with the Russian Navy." The Pacific Fleet ships are to visit China this year. In the opinion of Zhang Lianzhong, this opens good prospects for future cooperation between the navies of the two countries. According to the press center of the Russian Navy, Vice Admiral Zhang Lianzhong is to meet heads of the "Oboroneksport" [defense industry export] association today. On Wednesday, the Chinese military official is to meet heads of the Russian Defense Ministry and shipbuilding industry department, and then fly to St. Petersburg.

South African Ambassador Discusses Progress of Reforms

PM0604124393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 7

[Boris Pilyatskin report on undated interview in Moscow with South African Ambassador Gerrit Olivier: "'Reforms Policy Is Like Riding a Bicycle. Stop and You Will Fall Off.' RSA's First Ambassador to Russia Is IZVESTIYA's Guest"]

[Text] The fate of all true reformers shows how difficult it is to follow a path with people trying to overtake you on the left and right, threatening to knock you over, Gerrit Olivier, first ambassador of the Republic of South Africa [RSA] in Moscow, said at a meeting in the editorial office.

He is sure that you must not to show signs of hesitation. The reforms policy is like riding a bicycle. Stop and you will fall off. He considers that in this respect the situation in the RSA is reminiscent of what is taking place in Russia.

The specific situation of South Africa is that it is having to pay for apartheid, which used the law to divide people according to the color of their skin. Now apartheid has been repealed, but the psychological, linguistic, and cultural differences among ethnic groups in the RSA cannot, of course, disappear in an instant or even over 500 years. The ambassador thinks that perhaps they will never disappear and will remain a potential source of friction and conflict. This is why it is important to produce a modus vivendi protecting the rights of each and every person and precluding the possibility of the suppression of national minorities.

In contrast to the other countries of the African continent, where power was transferred from colonial regimes to representatives of a homogeneous black population, the situation is different in the multiracial and multinational RSA (out of a population of 35 million, 25 million are blacks, 5.5 million are whites, 3.5 million are coloreds, and 1 million are Indians). It is not the complete domination of the African National Congress [ANC], as the "freedom fighters" thought, but the division of power between the National Party, the ANC, and other political groups which is the only sensible basis for achieving peace and harmony. If you shoot a zebra, it doesn't matter whether you hit a white or a black stripe—the beast will die. South Africa is like a zebra, the ambassador says. If the whites suffer, the blacks will also suffer, and vice versa.

President Frederik de Klerk and his supporters think that the country requires a federal structure with a decentralized administration. In direct opposition to this, the ANC advocates a unitary state with a strong central government. Here you should take into consideration the fact that a leftsit radical wing is actively working within the movement and is demanding that Nelson Mandela and other moderate leaders not agree to concessions. At the same time, on the right-wing conservatives are accusing the president of capitulating and of betraying the "interests of the white man." As a result F. de Klerk's centrist policy is caught between a rock and a hard place.

The danger to democracy in South Africa also comes from the fact that, as a result of historical conditions, the ANC is in alliance with the communists, who dominate the ANC Executive Committee. The government acknowledges the potential danger of this, but it is not impossible that the ANC will distance itself from the South African Communist Party before the elections. And if the latter enters the elections alone, it will immediately become clear that it is supported by only the most insignificant number of people in the RSA and that communism can hope for nothing in the new democratic South Africa.

Both the CPSU's support for subversive activities in South Africa and the apartheid policy made our countries enemies for a long time. Today a line has been drawn under the past. Full normalization of diplomatic relations has taken place, and a foundation has been laid for developing ties in the areas of trade, science and technology, culture, and sport.

Throughout the past months painstaking work has been in progress to elaborate corresponding agreements, and they will soon be signed, including, probably, agreement on a credit line for Russia for approximately $40 million to stimulate trade and economic ties between the two countries.

Gerrit Olivier also touched on the subject of immigration, in particular of Russian citizens. He noted that the RSA is experiencing an economic recession, and the number of unemployed has increased significantly, whatever the color of their skins. On top of all this, the unprecedented drought, which has significantly weakened our agriculture, is a great burden on the South African economy. All this limits the country's ability to admit immigrants.

The ambassador knows that many different agencies have appeared in Russia recently which promise to swiftly establish their clients in the South African El Dorado. This is deception and, before swallowing the bait, Mr. Olivier advised, it is best to approach the embassy, which is always willing to provide the necessary information.

Qatari Foreign Minister Meets Deputy Foreign Minister

LD0604123993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1125 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—Qatar's Foreign Minister Shaykh Hamad Bin-Jasim Bin-Jabbur Al Thani, who is visiting the Russian capital, held talks today with Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Kunadze. "The visit is a favorable opportunity for developing bilateral relations," Viktor Posuvalyuk, head of the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry's Department for Africa and Near East, told the ITAR-TASS correspondent at the end of the talks. The sides exchanged views on strengthening stability and security in the Persian Gulf and on problems of the Near East settlement, and also discussed a number of international issues. Particular attention was devoted to discussing the prospects for bilateral economic cooperation and, in particular, to goods and raw materials supplies from Russia and Qatar's investment in Russia's economy.

Defense Official Meets UAE Defense Minister

LD0704074893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0629 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Viktor Lebedev]

[Text] Abu Dhabi April 7 TASS—Defence Minister of the United Arab Emirates Shaykh Muhammad Bin-Rashid Al Maktum received Chairman of the Russian Committee for Defence Industries Viktor Glukhikh in Dubayy on Tuesday. They discussed the situation in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf zone, as well as issues dealing with the development of relations between Russia and the United Arab Emirates.

Glukhikh is now on a working visit in the United Arab Emirates. He had a meeting with Minister of State for Foreign Affairs Shaykh Hamdan Bin-Zayid Al Nahayyan and the chief of general staff of the UAE armed forces. The two sides discussed the development of cooperation between the two countries in various spheres of the economy, including the military-technological sphere.

Political Issues

Russia 'Will Never Start' New Round of Nuclear Tests

LD0604131493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1230 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Russia will never start a new round of nuclear tests, President Boris Yeltsin asserted in a conversation with Aleksey Yablokov, his adviser on ecology, before leaving for Vancouver. The adviser revealed this at today's news conference on protection of the environment. He also said that 14 percent of Russia's territory can at present be regarded as ecological risk areas. To a significant extent, buried radioactive waste pollution comes from such sources as Chernobyl, Semipalatinsk, Tomsk, and Krasnoyarsk-26. Radioactive waste buried underwater also causes serious concern.

Rutskoy Criticizes Yeltsin for 'Going Begging'

LD0704111593

[Editorial Report] London BBC Television Network in English at 2100 GMT on 6 April broadcasts a three-minute report by correspondent Angus Roxborough in Moscow in its "Newsnight" program, including an interview with Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation.

Roxborough introduces an interview with Rutskoy by saying that the former Air Force pilot, much decorated in the Afghan war, ridiculed Yeltsin for "going begging" to President Clinton. He continues by saying that as an officer Rutskoy said it would have been beneath his dignity. While sitting under a portrait of Peter the Great, Rutskoy pours scorn on Yeltsin's privatization program.

Rutskoy says: "They sold off a whole port on the Baltic with all its equipment for $2 million. That is the price of a few decent yachts. The market economy was not an end in itself. The old command system should not be destroyed but improved."

Roxborough concludes by saying that the battle for the Kremlin has begun in earnest.

Shumeyko Dismisses Rumors of 'Imminent Cabinet Reshuffle'

OW0604205193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1928 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Vladimir Shumeyko, First Vice Premier, dismissed in an Interfax interview the rumors, which have been circulating since the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies, of an imminent cabinet reshuffle. He noted, however, that the positions of a vice premier in charge of social policies and ministers of economy and justice were vacant.

On the increasing controversy about the pull-out of Russian troops from the Baltic states, Shumeyko said that those countries disregard the Russian interests. "First of all, he recalled, the troops stationed in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia used to be army units of the USSR where the Baltic countries were integrated. Today it is impossible just to move the troops afield." Shumeyko said that "with those who meet us halfway in construction of homes for servicemen the problem is being gradually solved." He said that the best relations in this field have been established with Lithuania.

Ministers' Presidium Meets, Chaired by Chernomyrdin

LD0704072893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0708 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—The Presidium of the Russian Council of Ministers began its regular meeting today under the chairmanship of Viktor Chernomyrdin. The agenda of the meeting includes a package of priority measures aimed at boosting the development of small and medium business in Russia, a system of special state institutions in charge of environmental protection, measures for stimulating environmental protection and the adoption of the convention on the protection of use of waterways going by the territory of several countries, and of international lakes.

Urgent Business Measures Approved

LD0704100593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0911 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—The Russian Council of Ministers Presidium today approved in principle a package of urgent measures to develop small and medium businesses. The 30-point package of measures is aimed at creating conditions for developing small-scale entrepreneurship as one of major strategic directions in the implementation of the economic reform in the country. The production and processing of agricultural produce, industrial, and consumer goods; the provision of industrial, communal, and consumer services; and industrial and residential construction were recognized as the main priorities in the development of small and medium businesses. The state will help these enterprises to obtain finances and credits, will help them with scientific and technical development, material and technical supplies, the sale of output, foreign economic activities, and staff training.

First Deputy Minister of Fuel, Energy To 'Transfer'

OW0604125693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin has freed Eduard Grushevenko from the duties of First Deputy Minister of Fuel and Energy in connection with his transfer to another job. The vacancy has been occupied by former Minister of Trade and Material Resources Vladimir Kostyurin. Grushevenko was in charge of distributing quotas and licenses for the export of energy and fuel. According to some sources, Grushevenko will work in one of the ministry's departments.

Commenting on his resignation, a high-ranking representative of the ministry, who preferred to remain anonymous, told INTERFAX on Tuesday [6 April] that the recently-appointed minister of fuel and energy, Yuriy Shafrannik, had strained relations with his first deputy. Besides that, a former Gosplan man (Gosplan is the former State Planning Committee), Grushevenko was looked upon as an outsider, although in the summer of 1992 he performed the duties of minister of fuel and energy for some time after the resignation of Vladimir Lopukhin.

According to INTERFAX sources, the ministerial post was also contested by Vadim Dvurechenskiy, who currently works as First vice-chairman of the Russian Committee for Geology and Mineral Resources, and is in charge of distributing licenses for the development of new mineral deposits.

Further on 6 Apr Roundtable in Moscow

Meetings May Bring 'Accord'

LD0604151493 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1330 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Academician Leonid Abalkin thinks that events in Russia may develop in three ways - civil war, dictatorship, or national accord.

He stressed today at a roundtable meeting in Moscow that the situation has sharply deteriorated. In his view, the current situation was caused by the disintegration of the economy and irrepressible inflation, and not by the government's inconsistency and political conspiracy. Abalkin has no illusions about the possibilities of the roundtable, but he thinks that it may help to achieve accord. Let me remind you that the roundtable was formed by the Supreme Soviet and government of Russia.

Rutskoy on 'Leakage of Funds'

OW0604183493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1709 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to different sources, in 1992 the flow of Russian capital abroad constituted $17-40 Mn [million], reported the Russian Vice Premier Aleksandr Rutskoy. In Rutskoy's words, this sum approximately corresponds to the volume of the Gross National Product which accounted for 15 trillion rubles in 1992.

During his conversation with journalists on Tuesday [6 April], Rutskoy, who attended the "round-table" conference of political and public associations, said that it is necessary to change the accounting mechanism on export-import operation in order to prevent the leakage of funds. If this is done, Rutskoy believes, there will be no need for western credits and investments. He called not to pay heed to the hope for "mythological aid" from the International Monetary Fund and Western countries, saying that Russia possesses necessary resources to independently surmount the economic crisis.

Further Rutskoy Remarks

LD0604172593

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1400 GMT on 6 April, as part of the "Novosti" program, carries a Vladimir Perfilyev report on the roundtable of representatives of socio-political parties and movements, set up by the decision of the Presidium of the Russian parliament, which held a session in Moscow today. It was chaired by Saburov, who called on those present to make a pact of economic solidarity. The discussion was interrupted by Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, who levelled sharp criticism at the government. He predicted chaos, civil war or dictatorship.

In an interview with unidentified correspondents, Rutskoy says: "The financial system of the state has simply collapsed. We have had this mad outflow of capital, according to some sources $17 billion and according to others $40 billion, for the second year running; the gross national product for the year 1992 is calculated at 15 trillion rubles. It is not a difficult math problem: 17 trillion multiplied by 700 rubles—the dollar rate rounded off—and we obtain the same gross national product plundered. So if we sum it all up, will we be living in the conditions in which we are living now? Probably not. So what is needed is normal mechanisms of running the administration."

Pefilyev then interviews Saburov, who says if consensus does emerge, expectations should not get out of hand—we are so used to saying everything will be all right in two months. An unidentified man says we must rally all political forces to help the government and Supreme Soviet carry out the reforms.

Proceedings Summarized

LD0604202993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1920 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—A round-table conference to draw up recommendations for programmes of anti-crisis measures and for pushing forward reforms met in its fourth session in Moscow on Tuesday [7 April].

Participants included representatives of the Supreme Soviet, president, government, scientists, economists, trade union leaders, members of socio-political movements and associations, renowned businessmen, financiers, industrialists and farmers.

The session was opened by Russian Parliament First Deputy Chief Yu. M. Voronin and chaired by Academician N. Ya. Petrakov, director of the Russian Academy of Scientists' Institute of Market Problems.

"To accomplish the tasks faced by the round-table conference, it should be made clear that there are no people in society today who oppose economic and political transformations. However, there exist several programmes of measures to haul the country out of crisis and stabilise the economic situation in the country. The government's attention was drawn to them but the reaction was zero," Russian Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy said in his speech.

Ye. F. Saburov, director of the Russian Government's Centre of Information and Social Technologies, came up with the proposal to draw up a package of measures, "economic solidarity". He believes that as the economic situation is worsening and inflation spiralling, various political forces need to reach a consensus regarding measures that could help improve and reform the national economy.

To achieve these goals, the load of the crisis needs to be divided evenly between varous social groups; the state backing ought to be given to and, in any case, the existing barriers to the operation of the new, private sector of the economy be cleared.

Mindful of the need to create new workplaces, a host of basically short-term measures that would bring down inflation within two years, trim the budget deficit and stave off mass unemployment should be adopted.

Saburov said the country needs a document recording the achievement of accord and imposing a two-year moratorium on the adoption of any laws, resolutions and other acts that run counter to the agreement reached.

Russian Academy of Sciences' Institute of the Economy Director Leonid Abalkin voiced serious concern over the non-stop production slump, the catastrophic depreciation of the rouble, the mounting insolvency crisis, the impoverishment of the population and the grave ecological and criminogenic situation.

He proposed to the participants in the round-table a draft agreement on anti-crisis measures for 1993. It puts emphasis on the need to give up the ruinous reform policy based on the concept of weakening the state influence on the economy and pursued at a time when the country is plagued by the severest economic crisis.

Abalkin proposed that the government take urgent measures to stabilise production and ensure a rise in the investment activity, adjust the price policy (including their control and regulation) and taxation, improve matters in finances and privatisation and protect the rouble as the Russian currency.

The authors of this project think that setting several priorities in the structural policy (fuel and energy, food, housing, conversion and comunications) may provoke limited state financial resources to be spread thin on the vast number of programmes. Meanwhile, the actual executor of any programme is the investment sphere which, in turn, largely belongs to the military-industrial complex.

Other solutions were also offered: to concentrate the bulk of funds on the state programme to convert the military industry to commercial production so as to tackle many other priority problems involved in the restructuring through this programme, including the food, housing and other problems.

The proposed projects stirred a lively debate. As a result, participants elaborated a package of recommendations, discussed the round-table conference procedure and adopted the proposal to issue an information bulletin.

Deputies Say Survival 'Not Possible' With Yeltsin

PM0604120093 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Article by RSFSR People's Deputy Ivan Shashviashvili and USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Golik, in form of letter to Yeltsin: "Survival Is Simply Not Possible With This President"]

[Text] On 20 March you, the president "elected by the whole people," favored your people with a long-promised message. It is well known, and is not the point at issue here. If you remember, you started your message with the words "Today I signed an edict," and went on to set forth the substance of that edict. But only a few days later, a different edict was published. And you, once again wagging your finger at us from the screen of the "box," declared that your previous remarks were only a statement of political intentions.

The main milestones of your tramplings through power in the last three years are not without interest.

On the USSR Supreme Soviet, which you only "penetrated" thanks to the "patriotism" of Kazannik [deputy who gave up Supreme Soviet seat to make way for Yeltsin], you did not really do any work at all. Presumably you were preparing for the forthcoming assault on the bastions of power.

In 1990, at the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, you were elected chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, with great difficulty, with Gorbachev's help, and with the smallest possible majority of votes. Almost immediately you withdrew from all work and started demanding additional powers and so forth. Your rating plummeted. Unwilling to give up your privileges—yes, that is how it was—you embarked on the path trodden by Gorbachev and decided to become president. However, the situation was changing before our very eyes, and your analysts made a tough and accurate prediction:

Half the voters would not vote for you. So a law "tailor-made for Yeltsin" was hurriedly drawn up—votes would be counted only in terms of the number who took part in the voting. In other words, if 50 percent of the voters plus one turn out to the polling places, the elections are valid. If 50 percent plus one of those who turn out vote for you, you are president. Fine! And as for the fact that that only represents 25 percent of the total number of voters, plus one—never mind, forget about it.

Incidentally, it was not only your supporters who were making calculations. During those days PRAVDA gave the most accurate prediction—not more than 44 percent would vote for you. And so it turned out.

So there you were, president. An ultra-solemn inauguration; the words "Russia, 1,000 years old, is rising from its knees"; the ceremonial but stupid celebration of "100 days" in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses; meetings, banquets, lavish receptions... And on the other hand—the total impoverishment of the people, a slow-burning civil war, hunger and tears for millions of people.

The Sixth Congress of People's Deputies was the first clearly anti-Yeltsin Congress. The deputies began to see the light. Your nerve snapped, you took offense and left the auditorium.

The Seventh Congress—and the deputies started talking about impeachment. You scarcely appeared in the auditorium.

The Eighth Congress—and People's Deputy M. Chelnikov, in the past a zealous supporter and defender of yours, spoke about impeachment. No vote was taken, and the proposal was left to "ride."

The Ninth Congress. Voting: 617 "for" your removal, 268 "against."

That was two-thirds of those taking part in the vote (remember the rules that governed your election as president), but what was needed was two-thirds of the listed 1,033. Nearly 150 deputies fled like cowards, avoiding the vote. But this was complete political defeat.

Mention must also be made of two occasions when you helped some of the vacillators to see the light and drove some of your own supporters away.

First—your strange appearance and speech 24 hours before the vote. That could not be concealed. The Congress received hundreds of telegrams in which people clearly and simply demanded your removal from power. So your henchmen's words: "excessive tiredness," "a hot shower"—were disbelieved.

Second—your Sunday speech to "the people" on Vasilyevskiy Spusk, where you not only refused to fulfill the constitutional demands of "those people" in the Kremlin, but swore it to a certain Mrs. Bonner. In July 1991 you swore on the Constitution, but in March 1993 you were taking oaths to Bonner. She has apparently taken the place of the Constitution for you. So it really is just one step from the sublime to the ridiculous.

At one Congress Nikolay Travkin warned everyone that without this president things would be even worse. He was telling the truth, but only half the truth. With this president, survival will be simply impossible.

Pro-Yeltsin Group Urges Support of President

LD0604231693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1036 GMT 6 Apr 93

[ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 6 April—The most loyal supporters of the Russian president have combined in the Public Committee of Democratic Organizations of Russia [Obshchestvennyy Komitet Demokraticheskikh Organisatsiy Rossii] and have called on all the country's citizens to participate in the referendum on 25 April. They have called on Boris Yeltsin to conduct a simultaneous poll of Russians.

A statement of the committee has been issued today and its authors appeal to the people "to support the power of the president of Russia, to support Boris Yeltsin like in the days of the August putsch." They propose that no re-election of the president should be held. The document sharply criticizes the Russian Congress of People's Deputies, which "has virtually completely taken on the form of a leading and directing structure of the CPSU," and has "deprived Russia of a legal space."

The statement says that "blatantly nationalistic 'fronts' and 'governments' are straining for power on the wave of discontent caused by the growth in prices, the looming unemployment, and other consequences of the disintegration of the totalitarian system." "While critical of some of the president's actions, we consider that it could be a truly national tragedy if these forces were to come to power."

In an open letter to the president, the committee called on him to hold, in parallel with the referendum, a poll of Russian citizens even though the head of state previously declared his unwillingness to "dissipate efforts" on two measures. It is proposed that three questions should be included on the ballot: Do you think it necessary to preserve the Congress of People's Deputies as the highest body of state power? Do you agree that the new Russian Constitution should be adopted not by the congress but by a body elected by the whole people—a Constituent Assembly convened no later than 1993? Do you agree that the Russian Constitution should state the right of each citizen of the Russian Federation to own, use, and dispose of land?

In order to coordinate the efforts of the democratic forces it is proposed to create a standing Consultative Council under the chairmanship of the president consisting of representatives and experts from political parties and public organizations.

The Public Committee of Democratic Organizations of Russia was created in March on the basis of a roundtable—which was an alternative to the official one convened by parliament and the government. The Democratic Russia movement was the main initiator for setting it up. According to the committee's organizers, it includes 88 parties and movements. The open letter to the president was signed by only 32 leaders of political and trade union organizations, the majority of whom have no particular influence. Among the well-known parties included in the committee are the Peasant Party of Russia, the People's Party of Russia, the Russian Movement of Democratic Reforms [RMDR]. The RMDR headed by former Moscow mayor Gavril Popov is the most ardent supporter of convening a Constituent Assembly.

Democratic Party's Travkin Calls For Pre-Term Elections

LD0704090893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0847 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tatiana Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—"Since politicians have failed to find a worthy way out of the constitutional crisis, it is now up to people, to society to solve this problem", Russian Democratic Party leader Nikolay Travkin told ITAR-TASS today.

According to Travkin, "both power structures—presidential and representative—would be doomed to go down as a result of voting if the vote were held without "psychological preparation". [quotation marks as received]

However, "massive brainwashing" taking place ahead of the referendum is clearly intended to relegate the citizenry to a position where it will only be permitted to play second-grade or third-grade roles in resolving the conflict between the legislative and executive structures.

Travkin said there was no alterative to pre-term elections. "Elections are needed not as an aim in itself but as a means of building an economic and social policy course aiming to raise living standards". This economic idea should be used as the motto of the referendum. Because "the patriotic calls" will fail to rally people in the present conditions—they only rally people in time of war.

The people at power at present are unable to raise the level of well-being. New politicians are needed, and there is no point in picturing the appearance of a new president and a new parliament as a tragedy, because it is "normal".

Asked if Travkin is planning to run in the elections he replied: "It is clear that I will not run for a seat in the parliament—I am not a man for sitting it out, and tracing every comma in a bill is not my cup of tea. As concerns a post in the executive, I am quite content with my present post—the head of administration of the Shakhovskoi district in the Moscow region, given they stop hampering my activity. Even after the president vested additional powers in the Shakhovskoy district administration head by decree I cannot extricate myself from endless court hearings where I have to prove the obvious".

Civic Union Leader Ponders Congress Results

PM0604150393 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 3 Apr 93 Single Edition p 1,3

[Article by Vasiliy Lipitskiy, chairman of the Civic Union Executive Committee, under the "Opinion" rubric: "Shock Deepens the Split at the Top. The Power of Regional Elites is Strengthening at Grass-Roots Level"]

[Text] Russian political life has experienced yet another crisis. This time it was caused by President Boris Yeltsin's televised address 20 March.

The president's address was preceded by a week of tense waiting. Having publicly declared that he was dissatisfied with the results of the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies, which finished 13 March, Yeltsin took a break. However, his apparatus constantly issued "leaks" of information on the tough measures being prepared.

The Supreme Soviet was not idle either. Although Ruslan Khasbulatov went off on a trip around the CIS countries and the deputies left for their districts, the degree of readiness for extreme circumstances was high. Crisis groups were secretly formed in the White House, and these constantly analyzed the situation.

Obviously this circumstance was not properly taken into consideration by the Kremlin strategists. There was also something else they did not take into account—the civic position of Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, Security Council Secretary Yuriy Skokov, and Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Zorkin. They were the ones who expressed their sharp disapproval of the unconstitutional actions first.

Rutskoy's refusal to initial the draft edict generated obvious panic among its creators. For several hours they literally never left the vice president's office, trying by hook or by crook to convince him that he should align himself with the organizers of the opus—after all, without his participation, the venture became highly dubious.

It was precisely during those hours that the evolution of the draft began, and in the end it was published only three days later in a completely different form: Rutskoy was shown one version after another, all hastily put together in an attempt to create something acceptable to him (which subsequently became the basis of the rumors of the vice president's "participation" in the preparation of the edict, which were unleashed by those who proved unable to drag him into their company.)

Aleksandr Rutskoy stood his ground. He sent the president a letter in which he explained his stance and asked Yeltsin to refrain from appearing on television.

But it was already too late. As is being asserted, copies of the video recording of the president's address were given to foreign diplomats that morning so that they could pass information on to their governments.

The vice president's stance generated numerous complaints against him in the next few days. But essentially his reaction was perfectly correct both in respect of the president and in respect of the Constitution.

The following opinion was circulated: If he does not agree, then he should resign. But that would mean that top officials should not have a civic stance. Who will make up the administration if everyone who has such a stance and risks disagreeing with the leadership, leaves it?

And so, the attempts to avert the publication of the edict proved unsuccessful. The president's television address went out all the same. But it went no further than mere talk. In fact the very next day the president's supporters started to play down its significance in their attempt to interpret the unconstitutional wording as no more than clumsy expressions.

What was the reason for this defeat? Primarily it was the complete lack of preparation and the ill-considered nature of the plan, which was carried out in the form of a spontaneous impulse. The first hurdle came as a complete surprise to the authors of the opus, and they gazed upon all the subsequent countermeasures, including the convening of an extraordinary Congress, with a feeling of doom.

The Congress started off far more calmly than expected. This was the result of the preparatory work, during which it proved possible to explain to the deputies that there was no real chance of impeaching the president, and even if there were, then, in the name of stability, it should not be taken. For many Russians, Yeltsin remains the national leader, and his removal would definitely generate a mass protest.

The president himself was markedly polite and constructive. His first speech essentially represented the only possible form of apology (without losing face) for the televised address 20 March.

By the end of the second day, it seemed that the Congress was approaching its conclusion. Despite all its sharp rhetoric, the draft decree did not threaten the president with any real trouble. By 1800 on 27 March, analysts agreed that the Congress had a maximum of two hours' work left.

The peace that was taking shape was yet again destroyed by Boris Yeltsin's speech. Paradoxical as it may seem, it was not a threatening speech, but on the contrary, a highly conciliatory and even pleading speech, but the president's mien, physical state, and the manner of his speech stunned the deputies.

Why did Boris Yeltsin appear on the rostrum on that Saturday evening? I repeat: The draft decree of which he spoke did not contain anything serious apart from a few offending words, but the president could not really think that the Congress would agree to consider all that had happened a joke.

The only real threat contained in the text prepared by the Drafting Commission was not directed at the president, but at those who prepared his address and incited people to unconstitutional actions.

I am afraid that it was these very people, who were worried by their future, who incited Yeltsin to make an address which he should not by any means have made.

I would not like to participate in discussions of the reasons for the president's state on that Saturday. I can only bear witness to the fact that everyone present in the audience, including Yeltsin's most fervent supporters, were depressed and overwhelmed in equal measure.

By morning, these moods had been transformed into rage. The idea of impeachment literally arose again overnight. The deputies received the compromise draft decision that was born that night with all the greater hostility.

The problem that had emerged was rooted purely in psychology. The Supreme Soviet, Constitutional Court, and Government leaders believed that they had used the situation that had taken shape following the president's unsuccessful address, with maximum effect. They had achieved the cancellation of the referendum and consent to simultaneous elections of the president and deputies at a fairly close date—21 November.

But the indignant deputies were not able to calculate the situation a few moves ahead, and considered the compromise to be a defeat. Their perception was redoubled by the careless legal wprding of the document, which was prepared in haste, as well as by the outward similarity of the scenario to the Seventh Congress, where the presidium forced through a decision that has already been repealed by the subsequent Congress.

At sessions of various factions, a similar picture could be observed: Political leaders tried to explain to their comrades in arms the advantages of a coordinated draft decree and ways of bringing it in line with the Constitution without losing the gist, but no one listened to them. Both the democrats and the national-patriots were surprisingly united in rejecting the compromise.

The following question is now frequently being asked: Why were the centrists not visible at the Congress? Where was "Civic Union"?

Indeed rampaging passions is not the best situation in which to expound centrist positions. It was not just the Congress, but also external observers who turned a deaf ear to the considered, constructive speeches made by Adrov, Vilchek, Golovin, Mityukov, and other leaders of factions that form part of "Civic Union."

Those who actually want to cooperate with the deputies and obtain positive results should not resort to strong-arm methods. I remain convinced that the Congress is capable of tackling constructive tasks—as a result of patient work, which must be begun several weeks before any subsequent forum is held. "Civic Union" has been unsuccessfully trying to convince the president of this for the past few months.

The Congress was uncontrollable throughout the whole of Sunday 28 March. Passions in the hall were exacerbated by passions in the street, where rallies of the president's supporters and opponents were being held. Reports (mostly untrue) of troop movements and other threats were constantly coming into the Kremlin. No one listened to Travkin, who usually holds his audience. In such a situation a vote on impeachment became inevitable.

It yielded a result that had been confidently predicted even before the Congress started—the necessary two-thirds majority was not obtained. No reply was obtained from the irritated chairman of the Supreme Soviet either. Everything had to be done from the very beginning again.

But it had to be begun again in a completely different layout. A day which opened as a triumph for the congress, turned into the president's victory. He stood his ground in a situation that was completely unfavorable to him and obtained encouragement as a result of the all but forgotten method of direct communication with the masses at a rally.

Admittedly, during the rallies a great many superfluous things were said. Here again we should return to the question of influences on the president. Well-informed sources report that his second appearance at the rally, the night-time appearance, was incited by false information about an outbreak of passions threatening to result in mass disorder. But in fact, by then the majority of demonstrators had already gone home and the situation on St. Basil's hill was perfectly calm.

It appears that attempts were made to tie the president, and Premier Chernomyrdin with him, as firmly as possible to particular political groups, and provoke them to behave in such a way and say such things that would make any backtracking impossible.

On the final day, 29 March, the Congress avenged itself to a certain extent by including in the decree on the referendum a figure for the adoption of a decision on confidence in the president—50 percent of the registered electorate plus one vote. I would recall that in 1991, at the peak of his popularity, Yeltsin obtained the votes of 46 percent of the total number of registered voters. It is doubtful that a referendum in such a form would be of any interest to the president's supporters. We must expect them to take steps aimed at avoiding such a plebiscite or playing down its possible results.

What were the results of the Congress? Many people are even asking: Were there any results? I would nevertheless note two positive aspects. The first is the utterly sharp reaction to the violation of the Constitution by the top state official. For a society that is bogged down in lawlessness, this must be considered to be an achievement.

The second is a certain movement toward early elections. This question is included on the referendum ballot. Although it is still coming up against the internal resistance of the majority of deputies, the idea of these elections is winning more and more supporters. It is becoming increasingly clear that there is no other solution to the permanent political crisis.

But the negative consequences are far more numerous. The tension has not only remained, it has increased, and confrontation has gotten worse.

Even more alarming is something that one of the regional leaders said at the Congress: "However this ends, federal power does not interest me any longer." The central authorities, which are fighting among themselves, only have enough forces to block each other. Their decisions have less and less significance in the enormous territories of Russia, where the power of regional elites is stregnthening before our very eyes.

You get the impression that the unresolved conflict will continue to get worse. It can only be avoided if the president really starts to carry out the program that he set forth at the Congress, and in particular, if he forms a coalition government capable of stabilizing the situation in the period before the elections.

Court Justice Comments on Yeltsin's Actions

PM0504122393 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Interview with Constitutional Court Justice Viktor Luchin by Viktor Trushkov; place and date not given: "Russian Federation Constitutional Court Justice Viktor Luchin: 'Court Did Not Meet at Night Out of a Taste for the Exotic'"]

[Text] [Trushkov] Viktor Osipovich, what guided the justices in their decision to react promptly to B. Yeltsin's 20 March address?

[Luchin] Above all a desire to perform the extremely important task entrusted to us by Russia's basic law and the law on the Constitutional Court—to protect and defend the constitutional system.

[Trushkov] How did the Constitutional Court's involvement in the disturbing events of that Saturday begin?

[Luchin] Even before B.N. Yeltsin's television address we had learned that an edict on introducing special rule was being prepared, but since these were merely rumors, the court's reaction was, so to speak, on the theoretical, abstract level. On 20 March we had the draft edict initialed by Filatov, leader of the president's administration, and Shakhray, one of the deputy chairmen of the Council of Ministers.

[Trushkov] But the Constitutional Court is not entitled to evaluate draft documents and provide a legal assessment of them...

[Luchin] ...still less to submit its findings on them. But we did not do this. Although sight of the draft edict evoked great alarm and concern on the part of the majority of the constitutional justices. We saw it as a threat to the constitutional system.

[Trushkov] So the Constitutional Court waited with alarm for the promulgation of the president's address.

[Luchin] It became clear from B.N. Yeltsin's television address to Russian Federation citizens on 20 March that the edict could become a reality. In one version or another. Now findings by the Constitutional Court were clearly required—and became possible. But, once again, we were assessing not the draft edict and, of course, not the edict itself, which we had not seen, but the address. And we concluded that an address constitutes decisions and actions by the president. It was obvious that the constitutionality of a number of provisions of the address needed to be verified. We were most worried by the actual concept of the special procedure or system for rule, which is not a concept envisaged by legislation.

[Trushkov] And the introduction of a state of emergency presupposes an appropriate decision by the Supreme Soviet...

[Luchin] Yes, the participation of the legislative branch is required in order to introduce a legal state of emergency. Of course, if in the address and in the edict of which he spoke the president had limited the sphere of special rule to structures of executive power—once again within the framework of the law—there would have been no grounds for concern. Even the concept itself could have been "swallowed." But what the president was speaking of affected the competence not only of the executive but also of the representative and judicial branches of power. After all, the president stated that any decisions emanating from anyone aimed at repealing presidential edicts and government decrees do not have legal force. In other words the president removed his own edicts from the jurisdiction of the Congress, Supreme Soviet, and Constitutional Court and placed them above the law. This was an encroachment on the fundamental principles of the constitutional system—the separation of powers—and on the constitutionally established hierarchy of normative acts on the territory of Russia.

We also noted the public discrediting of the representative branch. For instance, the statement regarding the impossibility of compromise with the "conservative majority at the Congress." This was tantamount to disregard for state organs envisaged by the constitution.

A new, unconstitutional procedure for the subordination of heads of oblast, kray, and other regional organs of executive power was announced. There was also confrontation in the sphere of the national state structure and the constitutional rights of subjects of the Federation and provisions of the Federation Treaty were ignored.

[Trushkov] Did the justices conclude that Yeltsin's actions and decisions connected with his 20 March address give grounds for his impeachment?

[Luchin] Before beginning to prepare our findings, we had to decide precisely that question—are there grounds for sanctions? Impeachment is only one sanction, the most serious. We answered that question in the affirmative, being convinced that it was a question not of theoretical arguments, not of the president's intentions, but of actions and decisions.

[Trushkov] But the president's supporters, citing the law on the Constitutional Court, claim that the Constitutional Court violated the law, which prohibits it from submitting findings on questions that could be examined at its session in order to evaluate their constitutionality. It was absolutely clear that deputies would be bound to submit to the Constitutional Court a petition questioning the constitutionality of the president's actions and decisions connected with his appeal.

[Luchin] We were very mindful of that provision of the law, but the problem was much more serious. The president disclosed that he had already signed the edict. Then, when anyone tried to protest it, the Constitutional Court would have been powerless. By his edict the president deprived everyone of the right to review and repeal his acts. In other words, after promulgation of the edict on introducing special rule our decision that this act was unconstitutional would have had no legal force.

[Trushkov] So the president himself prompted you to take such actions?

[Luchin] By his address he effectively lifted from the Constitutional Court the ban on submitting findings before receiving a petition from someone. Moreover, the law on the Constitutional Court contains Article 21. It provides that the chairman of the court, "in cases brooking no delay, and in particular those threatening irreparable damage, sends to the relevant state organs and officials demands for the suspension... of decisions..."

[Trushkov] This was certainly precisely such a case brooking no delay.

[Luchin] The majority of the justices evaluated it as precisely that. After all, the president announced that the edict on special rule had been signed and a package of acts had been prepared in development of this edict. Overall they could have changed the constitutional system and its basic principles so substantially that silence by the Constitutional Court would have been tantamount to a betrayal of its oath.

[Trushkov] Why did the court have to meet not only during the day but also at night?

[Luchin] The Constitutional Court met during the night of 22 March by no means out of a taste for the exotic. There could be no delay in the prevailing conditions.

Constitutional Court's Work Viewed

PM0504135593 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 pp 1, 5

[K. Aleksandrov report: "Who Will Defend the 'Third' Estate?"]

[Text] After the series of Constitutional Court rulings against the executive, and especially after the events of 20 March, a torrent of sewage commanded by the Kostikovs and Poltoranins descended on its head from television screens and the pages of the democratic press. Now the "third" estate too has learned from its own experience who is boss, and has found it that it itself is for the time being just a window dressing. But the Constitutional Court clearly does not intend to resign itself to this role.

The other day a meeting was held between Constitutional Court Chairman V. Zorkin and judges N. Vedernikov, G. Gadzhiyev, and B. Ebzeyev and journalists from a whole series of publications. Opening the meeting, B. Zorkin expressed extreme concern over the situation prevailing in the country in which "even the small island of arbitration which the Constitutional Court represents is being pulverized."

It was obvious to the naked eye that the judges were literally stunned by the coordinated torrent of slander and insinuation that has been directed against them: These include myths about the apartments of V. Zorkin and his relatives, the vile lie that he handed the Court's ruling to the president at the cemetery, and pseudoscientific judgements about procedural violations in his reaction to B. Yeltsin's television appeal. At the same time the Court is not being allowed even to refute the lies—the statements of its press service are simply ignored by the majority of the organs of mass media.

In the opinion of G. Gadzhiyev, the harassment was provoked by the fact that on 20 March the Constitutional Court did not take a formalistic atttitude, did not bide its time for 10 days or something of the kind, but reacted promptly to events. But this was in fact its direct obligation, for everything suggested that the so-called "special rule procedure" had already begun to operate—V. Zorkin could not contact B. Yeltsin, and all appeals were ignored.

Indeed, even now every obstacle is being put in the way of the Court's continuing its investigation. It has still not been presented with the president's edict signed 20 March, or other materials. With great difficulty it has managed to clarify who specifically prepared the draft decree. It was the not unknown Messrs Shakhray, Sliva, and Baturin. The last-named gentleman is interesting in that he is simultaneously a member of the Presidential Council, an official of the Gorbachev Foundation, and the main expert of the television program "Itogi," in other words, he himself plots the coup, himself implements it, and himself comments on it.

According to the appraisal of the Court, the actions taken by the president and his decisions have had an acutely negative effect on the state integrity of Russia. Thus, immediately after the television appeal the Tuva Republic included in its Constitution a clause on the right to secede from the Federation. Social tension has also intensified. The term "red-browns" is once again in vogue. The Court does not formally have the ability to react directly to this. It is a matter for the Prosecutor's Office, but the Constitutional Court can raise the question of the latter's responsibility for nonfulfillment of its constitutional obligations.

In connection with the possibility of some parallel ballots or polls being held 25 April it was stated that they can have no juridical force, especially if the text of the new Constitution is submitted to such a ballot. To decide this question in the space of three weeks means to profane the will of the people.

Replying to a question from SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's correspondent about the correctness of the currently widespread interpretation of the principle of the separation of powers as their complete mutual independence and ability to ignore one another, the judges expressed the opinion that the Constitution in general has become an instrument of political struggle, a stick with which the organs of power beat one another. Constitutional principles are being used improperly, just as in Mark Twain's "Prince and the Pauper" Tom Canty uses the state seal to crack nuts. The principle of sovereignty is being used to destroy the country, and now with the aid of the principle of the separation of powers the state structure itself is being split asunder.

Is the Constitutional Court capable of doing anything at all in such a situation, other than issuing rulings and decrees? Alas, no, at the moment. There is no mechanism for implementing its decisions, there is no law on liability for nonfulfillment. And this is very necessary today. For example, at the present time the Constitutional Court is examining a petition to verify the constitutionality of "shock therapy" and the deregulation of prices, which has led to the devaluation of the population's savings and the mass robbery of the people. If this is deemed unconstitutional, who will be obliged to fulfil this ruling, and how?

There is no answer, but one is needed urgently. The Constitutional Court, which is supposed to defend the rights of the people, is itself in urgent need of defense from the insinuations of the "fourth" estate and from the arbitrary rule of the zealous president's administration.

New Law on State Border Analyzed; Flaws Seen

PM0504155193 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Anatoliy Stasovskiy article: "A Border Without a Law Is No Border. A State Without a Border Is No State"]

[Text] The need for a law on the Russian Federation state border has long been evident. It has repeatedly been said at the highest level and in the mass media that it is time to end the fragmentation and squandering of the assets of Russia, which borders 16 countries and has 58,000 kilometers of border.

On 19 February our parliament at last adopted this long-awaited law. True, the president of Russia made several amendments to it. In particular, the president recommended that the administrative borders with the former union republics be regarded as the Russian Federation state border.

On 1 April, parliament discussed and unanimously adopted the law with the president's amendments. It now enjoys legal force in practice.

Incidentally, during discussion of the draft, deputies expressed concern primarily lest a "plowed boundary" (a plowed control zone) or a barbed-wire palisade were to appear between the inhabitants of Donetsk and Rostov Oblasts, South and North Ossetia, or the Lezghins living on the territory of Azerbaijan and Dagestan. It should be noted in respect of these doubts that the law's point of departure in specifying the state border arrangements is the historical fact of multinational peoples who have long lived together within a single state. The border arrangements and their constituent parts are established here by the Russian Federation's treaties with neighboring states based on the norms of international law. In the light of the mutual interests of Russia and adjacent states, particularly nearby foreign parts, certain rules pertaining to the state border may not be established, and borders may remain "transparent," that is to say, free for the completely unrestricted passage of people, goods, and means of transport.

Wherever damage is caused to Russia, and the border itself poses an overt or covert threat to Russian citizens and the state, the protection of the state border and the border arrangements may be strict in nature. Today this primarily concerns zones of acute ethnic conflicts.

Of course, many people today would like to know which states Russia will enjoy transparent borders with, as it were. It should be noted that the law does not establish this. It merely determines the bases for determining the border arrangements. Moreover, this question cannot be resolved unilaterally. For example, 35 border posts have now been set up with Ukraine. If that republic's leadership tightens border arrangements, Russia can only reply in kind.

With regard to the establishment of a state border and its protection along new boundary lines where there were previously no border zones a certain section of the population wonders whether this will not disrupt their customary way of life, will not inhibit their rights as citizens. These fears are devoid of foundation, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA was told by Professor Petr Ivanchishin of the Academy of the Russian Federation Security Ministry, one of the drafters of the law. First, the previous border zones, which occupied 15 percent of the territory of the former USSR, are now abolished. Border strip arrangements only are being introduced. This comprises a strip up to 5 kilometers wide along the state border on land, the sea coast, and the Russian banks of lakes and rivers. Second, the border strip may not include the territory of population centers, sanatoriums, other health establishments, and cultural facilities, or places where mass recreation and water activities are pursued or religious ceremonies performed. Third, the border strip, its limits, and the nature of the arrangements are determined by the organs of local self-administration.

Because of the complex and important nature of an entity such as the state border, the law vests security there in not just the Russian Federation Security Ministry border troops but also the Air Defense and Navy forces. It is important to note this, given that as of now the border troops are only 75 percent of their required strength. There is a shortage of 25,000 enlisted personnel and sergeants. The situation is most difficult in the border troops subunits located in trouble spots, where enlisted personnel and sergeants may be sent only at their own request.

And yet, despite all the difficulties, the Russian border troops detained goods worth 630 million rubles in the first two months of 1993, and during this time our soldiers have been involved in fighting more than 30 times. The border troops consider that they will be able to exercise their rights more successfully, given the law on the state border.

Special difficulties can arise on the new maritime border. As Rear Admiral Nikolay Ilyev, deputy commander of the border troops, said in conversation with your KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent, he is primarily worried by logistics support. We have modern ships and service craft capable of protecting the border and the economic zone, but they cannot always achieve their specifications and performance characteristics because there is no fuel, diesel oil, or finances. Quite a few difficulties are also arising during the redeployment of maritime border combined units from the Baltic, Georgia, and Azerbaijan, which is inevitable in view of the organization of the Russian state border.

There is another serious problem which Rear Admiral Ilyev spoke about. It concerns the service of the maritime border troops in the Pacific. The general commercialization of the majority of Far East fishing organizations has complicated in many respects the border troops' service. It can happen that a ship suspected of illegal activity in an economic zone will simultaneously belong to three or five joint ventures, including Russian ones. All the formalities look as if they are being observed. But in fact under the cover of contracts concluded by persons unknown our maritime wealth is being plundered. What is needed first and foremost, the admiral stressed, is a clear legal base and clear regulation of the activities of joint ventures.

If, however, you are to talk about what the law lacks, specialists note first of all that questions concerning responsibility for violation of the adopted norms do not find expression in it. There were two approaches to this in the Supreme Soviet: Either appropriate paragraphs on responsibility could be introduced into the draft law on the state border or they could be drafted separately.

Eventually, it was resolved not to overload the law and to introduce gradual changes and additions to the codes—the Criminal Code, the Code on Criminal Procedure, and the Code on Administrative Violations. But it is not known yet when this will happen. On the whole, the adoption of the law on the Russian Federation state border is not just of great political significance but great economic significance too.

Referendum Issues

Further Shumeyko Comment on Referendum Questions

OW0504173393 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1517 GMT 5 Apr 93

["Exclusive" interview with First Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shumeyko by INTERFAX correspondent Vitaliy Dzhibuti in Moscow on 5 April; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] IF [INTERFAX]: Which propositions do the president and his supporters regard as the most important ones among those put forward in the April 25 referendum?

Vladimir Shumeyko: The president and his team are only interested in two of them, number one and number four: that on confidence in the president and that on the re-election of the deputies before their term expires. We are not really interested in the other propositions.

IF Note: The Ninth Congress of People's Deputies has decreed that four questions should be put on the referendum ballot papers:

1. Do you have confidence in the president of the Russian Federation?

2. Do you approve of the socio-economic policy pursued by the president and government of the Russian Federation since 1992?

3. Do you think a new presidential election is necessary before Boris Yeltsin's term expires?

4. Do you think the people's deputies should be reelected before their term expires?

IF: Many people regard question two as the determining one. Do you agree with this?

V.S.: I believe this is an unfair question to ask. It's actually the same as asking, Do you approve of the fact that you have less money in your pocket now, or, that the prices have gone up, or that production is falling? And it is an illogical question too, because confidence in the president automatically means confidence in his policy. For this reason, during our referendum campaign we will focus on questions one and four.

IF: What political consequences could the referendum have?

V.S.: If question one were answered in the affirmative by more than 50 percent of those who actually take part in the voting, the president would be justified in continuing the entire policy he is pursuing now, and I think he will do so. (The congress decided that any of the four propositions will be approved if a simple majority of the registered electors vote for it - IF.) But, if more than 50 percent of the registered electors said yes, the president would be justified in convening a constitutional assembly and putting the draft constitution before it. He would also be able to call a new parliamentary election. All that would mean we would have a new Russia, new development.

IF: Are you sure the people will give support to the president?

V.S.: Certainly. I've had many letters from electors, 90 percent of whom express their support for the president and his policy. I'm being told, of course, that our adversaries wouldn't write us any letters. But even so, the president's policy has very many supporters.

IF: The people's deputies don't share your view, however.

V.S.: The deputies are intelligent people, and they know it would be extremely difficult to hold a new election before their term expired. In fact, I don't think there will be a new election whatever the referendum shows. When I was working in the Supreme Soviet, we passed a law which makes it practically impossible to recall a deputy. If a new electoral law is passed, the deputies will naturally make sure that it ensures that their be no pre-term elections on their posts.

IF: The Ninth Congress appointed two new deputy chairmen to the Supreme Soviet. Do you think Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov has had his positions strengthened thereby?

V.S.: Khasbulatov used to have his positions strengthened at each congress. But at the last one he said, on one occasion, "Nobody has ever made greater mistakes in choosing people than I have." I know what he meant. He had always been choosing his own deputies, who would later leave him. Whether Ispravnikov and Agafonov will do so I don't know. (Sergey Filatov, Yuriy Yarov, and Shumeyko himself, now in the presidential team, but used to be Khasbulatov's deputies. - IF.) Whether Khasbulatov has had his positions strengthened by being given those new deputies is not that important. You see, no politician can have strong positions in Russia today if he isn't in step with the general developments in the country. I don't really think that either the people's deputies nor Ruslan Imranovich (Khasbulatov) himself are doing so. So he could have eight, twelve, or sixteen new deputies, and that wouldn't make his positions much stronger.

I am convinced that the president and his supporters will win in the end.

Referendum 'Opinion Poll' Remains 'A Possibility'

OW0604113993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1027 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russia's Minister for the Press and Information, Mikhail Fedotov, told INTERFAX that the opinion poll which the president would like to hold during the referendum, scheduled for April 25, is still a possibility. He also said that he welcomed the idea of using the referendum as a way of revealing what the population thinks about the draft constitution.

There is no talk about a parallel referendum, he said. An opinion poll may include not only the questions which can be answered by writing "Yes or No", but also include a wider range of questions, such as "What is your idea of the draft Constitution?", "What does not suit you in the draft Constitution?" "What amendments would you like to make?" The minister believes that the method of calculating votes during the referendum, approved by the congress of people's deputies (the decision is considered taken if it is supported by more than 50% of the total number of voters) goes against the Law on the Referendum. This does not mean, however, that the idea of the referendum should be given up. It must be held by all means, but its results should be summed up according to a different method (to win, the president is to score the votes of more than half of the citizens who have taken part in the referendum). Fedotov also said that the Central Electoral Commission will only announce the results of counting. As to the formal decision, it will be taken by the congress and it must not be at variance with the law and the Constitution.

Fedotov noted that the draft Constitution, based on the idea of a presidential republic, was prepared last year. He is also convinced that the presidential republic suits Russia best.

Presidential Referendum Strategy Explained

MK0604120293 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 7, 6 Apr 93 (signed to press 5 Apr) p 3

[Sergey Parkhomenko report: "You Wanted a Referendum? You Got It! Presidential Team Seriously Expects To Win on 25 April"]

[Text] The Ninth Congress measured out little time for preparations for the All-Russian referendum—scarcely four weeks. The mood with which the administration's central apparatus was setting about the task was fairly gloomy: "You may start writing about a new war. This time a war of referendums," Anatoliy Sliva, the president's official spokesman at the Russian Supreme Soviet said in a conversation with a SEGODNYA correspondent. "The anticonstitutional nature of the congress' decrees will force the president to call an alternative poll. This means parallel commissions on the ground, campaign fights, different ballot boxes, confusion with the ballot. It is horrible."

The way events have evolved, however, has quickly overturned this pessimistic prediction made by an authoritative lawyer. After scarcely more than 24 hours it finally became clear that Boris Yeltsin had decisively given up the idea of "his own" plebiscite to countervail the "deputies' one"—despite emphatic recommendations that were voiced at his post-congress meeting with his scant supporters in parliament and backed by several participants of the Presidential Council's regular meeting.

Commenting for SEGODNYA on the tactical line the administration is planning to follow in preparing the referendum, Vyacheslav Volkov, deputy chief of the president's administration, insisted: "The wording of the first question as adopted by the congress, in effect, echoes the demands that were voiced in the president's address on 20 March and we are quite content with it."

The second question evokes quite different assessments: It is an absolutely crazy, absurd question. But we, in fact, do not intend to pay any attention to it, proceeding from the fact that this wording in reality does not carry any legal or social connotation. Let us even assume that most voters give a negative answer to the question: "Do you approve of social and economic policies..." What will it mean? Maybe, the people are dissatisfied with the course pursued by the president because it is not radical enough? Maybe, an even more austere policy is needed in the current economic situation? Or, maybe, by saying "No" the voters will express their disgruntlement at the fact that the Supreme Soviet, which has its own executive structures along parallel lines with the government ones, is vigorously impeding the reform carried out by the president?..

As for the third question, the president has recently said in his speeches from various rostrums, including his televised address on 20 March, that he did not intend to shirk elections, nor was he afraid of them. At the same time it is clear to any voter: If he answers the first question affirmatively thus expressing confidence in the president, it would evidently be illogical to vote for the president's reelection in the same breath..."

Let it be said parenthetically that this very question of whether it would be logical or not has become the subject of a fairly lively debate among those surrounding Yeltsin. For instance, when the Presidential Council was discussing various options for the main slogan under which the propaganda campaign was to be launched on behalf of the president, Gavriil Popov actively advocated the "four 'Yes'" formula. Most of his colleagues, however, who are less inclined toward fine tactical reasoning, finally appear to have had their way and persuaded members of the presidential staff that explaining the reason behind this shrewd finesse to anybody except those living in two or three traditionally politicized large cities will be virtually impossible and that the average voter, when making up his mind in front of the ballot box, is unlikely to fathom the idea of the three-move combination (referendum victory—early elections—Yeltsin's reelection for a new term) devised in the capital.

According to Vyacheslav Volkov, the presidential team is planning to concentrate their efforts first of all on the demand that the formula for summing up the result of the poll be changed. At the same time, only few people expect that the Constitutional Court will pass a favorable ruling. Sergey Shakhray, for instance, is sure that "both requests—that the recent presidential edicts be checked as to their constitutionality and that those provisions of the decree establishing a quota for a decision to be made at the referendum be reviewed for lawfulness—to all appearances will be shelved by the Constitutional Court." In these circumstances the failure on the part of the Supreme Soviet leadership to have the hastily prepared package of amendments to the Law on Referendum approved by parliament on the first try looks fairly promising.

Generally speaking, the first week of preparations for the poll in a sense looks like a warm up session. The fate of the 25 April referendum will be decided in the Russian province. After conversations in Kremlin lobbies I have the impression that there are no particular apprehensions here with regard to direct resistance by local authorities. It is considered just as unlikely that the White House will move to send express instructions to the regions requesting that the organization of the poll be impeded. What appears to be the most serious threat is that they may hastily begin implementing the congress decisions on parliamentary control over the mass media: Local soviets are very unlikely to miss the chance to lay their hands on oblast television and radio studios and change the status of independent publications, which are still a rare phenomenon in the province. "The repercussions from the decree 'On measures to ensure the freedom of speech...' will sweep the province much faster than the center. The idea of setting up councils of observers, the demands that air time be given to the opposition—all this will be met with active support in the periphery," Vyacheslav Volkov is convinced.

Finally, the presidential staff expects a fairly significant effect from the upcoming consultations with leaders of Russian autonomous entities. The Kremlin has repeatedly proposed these last few weeks that the Council of Heads of Republics be convened for negotiations to be chaired by the president. There is not the slightest doubt that the desire to ensure that the referendum is held indeed throughout the Russian Federation may force the Yeltsin administration to accept unprecedented sacrifices. When asked whether Moscow is facing the need to buy support for the referendum from regional authorities piecemeal, they have here the following answer: "What you call trade, we call compromise..."

Statistical Analysis of Referendum Scenarios

MK0604123093 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No 7, 6 Apr 93 (signed to press 5 Apr) p 3

[Dmitriy Yuriyev report under the rubric "Confrontation": "April Poll in Russia. Forecast Not Comforting, But Optimistic"]

[Text] An analysis of the reliability of voting tallies, and of the structure of voters' preferences in the elections of Russia's president and of deputies of the RSFSR and the USSR, and of referendums of the RSFSR and the USSR (1989-1991)—all available to SEGODNYA's information and analysis service—make it possible to draw three conclusions that are vital in the light of the impending referendum-93.

First, political preferences of Russian voters are rather stable. True, the "political naivete" of the population (especially the rural population) sometimes causes confusion and variations in voting patterns, but when asked yes or no, no more than 20 to 30 percent of voters support positions, figures, and symbols directly related to traditional communist ideology.

Second, there is a natural inverse proportionality between the "level of free thinking" and "discipline" of voters. In June 1991, in rayons that formed Yeltsin's power base, "attendance" at the polling places was as a rule much lower than that in the small number of rayons (mainly rural) carried by Nikolay Ryzhkov.

Third, a statistical analysis of the trustworthiness of election results makes it possible to suppose that the favorite methods of election rigging chosen from among all possible methods are those that make it possible not to involve too many outsiders in the process. Besides, rigging is resorted to only when the riggers are personally interested in the outcome and have reliable guarantees of immunity.

The renewed rigid polarization in society today makes it possible to suppose with a great degree of probability that confidence in Yeltsin and the early election of deputies will be supported by nearly 70 percent of the electorate taking part in the voting. A year of upsets for Yeltsin's social and economic policy has failed to diminish the social differentiation engendered by 70 years of Soviet history. Accordingly, Yeltsin has managed to preserve in the public consciousness the image of an "anti-nomenklatura alternative."

With a much smaller degree of confidence it is possible to predict between 40 and 60 percent of "yes" votes on the question of social and economic policy, and from 30 to 50 percent as regards early presidential elections.

The 1991 election statistics suggest that, most likely, the main method of rigging will be the removal and destruction of some of the ballots. That will bring down (by between 10 and 15 percent, as the 1991 experience in some regions in 1991 shows) the percentage of participation. The president's opponents will obviously direct their propaganda campaign mainly to bringing down the "percentage of participation."

Finally, should the percentage of participation around the country prove not too high, the following outcome is most probable: Around 70 percent of participants in the referendum would give a vote of confidence in the president and vote for new elections of deputies (this is 49 percent of the total number of [registered] voters if the turnout is 70 percent); a considerably smaller share of votes would be cast in favor of approval for the "policy" and new presidential elections.

These results would add a further twist to the spiral of tension. A "war of interpretations" would begin, ranging from the obvious to exotic ones (for example, "the president was given a no-confidence vote because [only] 49 percent of the total electorate voted for him—nor do the people want new presidential elections; his powers should be transferred to the vice president until June 1996"). It is interesting, however, that given a high enough turnout percentage, Yeltsin's victory can all at once become inevitable rather than unlikely.

Court Judge Says Referendum Will Favor Yeltsin

LD0604171693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1543 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Krasulin]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—"The results of the April 25 referendum will be favourable for President Boris Yeltsin," ITAR- TASS was told by Vladimir Oleynik, one of the judges of the Russian Constitutional Court. "I am sure that the referendum is necessary and that it is the president's right to announce it. This is not written down in the constitution, but the presidents of all the civilised countries of the world are vested with this right. Why wasn't such an amendment promptly made in the present constitution without bringing the matter to a head. This wouldn't have contradicted the letter and spirit of the constitution. The president also has the right to put any questions to a referendum. But they must be formulated not in the spirit of confrontation, but with due realisation of the powers vested in the Supreme Soviet, the congress and the president". If the president wins, the Supreme Soviet will have to legalise this right. In Oleynik's opinion, Yeltsin's main goal now is to push through a new constitution.

Analysing the reasons behind the current constitutional crisis, Oleynik notes that it was to some extent due to the present discrepancy between the country's basic law and the actual domestic situation. "The present constitution of the Russian Federation, together with its entire package of amendments, is the result of our state policy. Of course, we are faced with a constitution that was adopted in a non-existent state, which had a different economic and political system. It does not meet today's requirements, no matter how it is patched up or amended," he stressed.

Oleynik believes the only way to overcome the constitutional crisis is to adopt a "well thought-out and balanced constitution, which will not be tailored to meet current exigencies. And its adoption must not be dragged out". However, he warns against short-lived political approaches and legal arbitrariness in the process of drafting a new constitution. "In this case, endless amendments will have to be made to the constitution, no matter how universal it may be." He noted the need to work out a mechanism for adopting amendments, which would rule out subjectivism and arbitrary interpretation of the basic law.

Moreover, both the legislative and executive authorities must acknowledge the mistakes they have committed in the law-making process. Every draft law or decree must be subjected to a thorough legal analysis, because "their poor legal standard discredits not only the document, but also the person who signs it".

Oleynik notes that the conflicting sides do not realise the presence of a real third threat. "It is represented by the purely criminal stratum, which combines Bolshevism, in the worst sense of the term, with organised crime. It appeared even before the stagnation period, emerging from the structures that had substituted both the party and state bodies. It exploits the current confrontation by demagogically calling for law and order, higher living standards, etc. Its representatives often have no official status, but exploit the executive, legislative and judicial authorities to attain their goals. They are absolutely irresponsible for their actions, and the people, whom they use, become hostages of their policy. This may turn criminal all the governing structures."

Poll Shows Gains for Yeltsin in Cities, Forces

PM0604131193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 93 First Edition p 4

[Article by Leonid Sedov of the All-Russia Center for the Study of Public Opinion on Social and Economic Questions: "After the Congress There Are More People Wanting To Take Part in the Referendum"]

[Text] A poll of Russia's urban population (1,617 respondents in 13 regions) conducted during the work of the Ninth Congress showed that the only positive result of the Congress was perhaps an appreciable increase in the population's interest in the coming national referendum on confidence in the president.

The unprecedented public persecution of the head of state by 600 unbridled deputies in front of all honest people elicited a natural sense of protest in people, and the number of people intending not to take part in the referendum and waverers reached a record low. Whereas before the Ninth Congress the total number of abstainers fluctuated between half and two-thirds of the population, during the Congress they amounted to just 38 percent (25 percent who intended not to take part and 13 percent who did not know).

The number of townspeople prepared to vote in support of the president reached a record high of 43 percent. The predominance of people with higher education (50 percent), entrepreneurs (60 percent), managers (58 percent), employees without higher education (49 percent), and the military (58 percent) is particularly noticeable here. The change of heart among officers is particularly noticeable. The unpardonable reprimands meted out to the "power" ministers can hardly help increase the parliament's popularity among the military, and contemplating the hysteria shown by the deputy with the bruised head can hardly have made a favorable impression on men in militia greatcoats who have seen the world. That is why the number of Yeltsin's supporters among career military men has risen by 21 points (from 37 percent in February), the number of his resolute adversaries has dropped by 10 points (from 16 percent to 6 percent), and the number of waverers has dropped from two-thirds to one-third.

But however important the military's sentiments are now for the president, nonetheless it is not the strategic button in the hands of its commander in chief that is of crucial significance for resolving the political crisis and for the country's future, but the small electronic voting buttons at the fingers of the mass of "people's representatives" who intend to remove the people's number one true representative. In order to do this they have devised a not overly resourceful snare in the shape of the rules for counting the votes in the coming referendum. You do not have to be Einstein to see that in a country affected by an all-embracing crisis, in a profoundly split society no one, even Jesus Christ, can obtain support from the votes of more than half those registered on the electoral rolls. According to the most optimistic forecasts, Yeltsin can get 46 percent of the votes, and in any normal country that result would be considered an outstanding achievement. You need only recall that during his 1984 election Reagan polled roughly 30 percent of the vote, while Bush became president with the support of 26 percent of the electorate. Those are the rules of a politically honest game, and no possible dodges by the Constitutional Court can obscure that fact.

At the same time, using an equally cunning maneuver, the Congress virtually secured itself against the prospect of a long-term loss of powers by refusing to set for the referendum a question of confidence in itself, in which it could expect the votes of no more than 25-27 percent of the voters. As for the question of early elections, as in any other question, it is very hard to expect a 50-percent result. At any rate, 30 percent of respondents have to date expressed themselves in favor of new parliamentary elections, 15 percent want the president to resign, and 34 percent lean toward the hopeless idea of compromise between the two branches of power. I think that the latter group will diminish as people realize that it is not a question of a personal conflict between Yeltsin and Khasbulatov (23 percent of respondents thought so), and not of any competition between the authorities (22 percent), but of a major confrontation between the reformist forces backing the president and the forces of counterrevolution and revenge who cover themselves with the fig leaf of a holey Constitution (34 percent realize this already)—between the past and the future. It is no accident that you find more people expressing a lack of confidence in the president among pensioners (23 percent against an average of 18 percent), whereas the figure is almost half as much (14 percent) in the 14-40 age group.

We would note in conclusion that all these figures are estimates and that we will be informing readers in the future about the Russian population's direct attitude to the questions in the form they will take in the referendum.

Arrangements for Soldiers To Vote in Referendum Explained

PM0504142393 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Apr 93 p 1

[Vladimir Yermolin report: "Servicemen Entitled To Take Part in the Referendum With All Citizens of Russia"]

[Text] As we promised in yesterday's issue, Aleksandr Korovnikov, chairman of the parliamentary Committee for the Affairs of Invalids, War and Labor Veterans, and the Social Protection of Servicemen and Members of Their Families, now assesses the Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium decree "On the Participation of Servicemen of the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, Other Forces, and the Federal State Security Organs in the All-Russian Referendum 25 April 1993."

First of all, Aleksandr Venidiktovich stressed, in accordance with the Russian Federation Constitution, all citizens in our country are equal and any attempts to limit in any way the right of servicemen to take part in the referendum are simply unlawful. Servicemen, those hired voluntarily, and members of their families regardless of whether they are on the territory of the Russian Federation or not, will take part in the vote. Conditions will be created to enable Russians serving in Germany, the Baltic region, the Transcaucasus, and elsewhere in nearby and distant foreign parts to exercise their civic right in full.

You may ask: What happens to those citizens who are serving in the Russian Armed Forces today but intend to return home—to Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and so forth—at the end of their service? Aleksandr Korovnikov believes that in that case the serviceman's individual preference should be taken into account—whether he intends taking part in the referendum or not. But the fundamental principle remains that provision in the decree which says that only citizens of the Russian Federation may take part in the referendum.

Media Issues

'Uncensored' Congress Media Decree Published

PM0604142193 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1,2

[Commentary by Valeriy Smirnov, member of the National Salvation Front Political Council, on Congress of Russian People's Deputies Decree "On Measures To Ensure Freedom of Speech in State Television and Radio Broadcasting and News Services," accompanied by text of "genuine (uncensored)" version of the same decree: "The Pen Is Mightier Than the Ax: How the Text of the Congress of People's Deputies Decree Was Edited"; for the ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA version please see the 5 April Central Eurasia DAILY REPORT p 39]

[Text] Almost a week after the Ninth Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies ended, ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA published 3 April the congress decree "On Measures To Ensure Freedom of Speech in State Television and Radio Broadcasting and News Services." Why did this decree spend so long "maturing" deep within the Supreme Soviet apparatus despite the fact that the main reason for its adoption by deputies was the "urgency of the situation" over "political censorship in state television and radio broadcasting"?

On close examination one is struck by the admittedly disguised but nevertheless considerable differences between it and the document which was discussed and voted on at the Congress. The host of editorial corrections (which, by the way, are not permitted after a decree has been adopted by the Congress as a whole) conceal three main deletions from its text:

— the Congress' instruction to draw up a statute on observation councils to ensure freedom of speech in state television and radio broadcasting has been reduced to a Federal Council alone. In other words, regional television and radio broadcasting has been "removed" from the sphere of the decree's operation.

— the appointment and dismissal of leaders of state television and radio broadcasting companies, which by decision of the Congress the Federal Observation Council is empowered to do, have "disappeared" and been transformed into a vague procedure of "coordination" between one unknown entity and another.

— and finally the point in the decree which defined the mechanism for the formation of the observation councils at all levels guaranteeing their pluralism and non-nomenklatura character has simply disappeared.

The point of these "editorial corrections" is clear: The observation councils are being transformed by the "apparatus method" from an effective organ of parliamentary supervision at all levels of television and radio broadcasting to a "two-bit" talking shop under the Supreme Soviet deprived of all powers whatsoever. In this way the leadership of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet has tried to emasculate the Congress of People's Deputies' decision by a bogus act of the supreme organ of state power in Russia, which is a punishable criminal offense.

It seems that the wave of substitutions of state acts which began with the president's 20 March edict which was sent back has now reached the pinnacles of the Russian Supreme Soviet. But whereas the president, hastily rewriting his edict, was afraid of the responsibility for an attempted coup d'etat, what is the Supreme Soviet leadership afraid of as it tries to prevent the scrapping of political censorship in state television and radio broadcasting?

The genuine (uncensored) version of the text of the decree, including the amendments to it adopted at the Congress, is appended below.

Decree of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies

"On Measures to Ensure Freedom of Speech in State Television and Radio Broadcasting and News Services"

Political censorship in state television and radio broadcasting has now acquired a new specific character, which is manifesting itself in the uneven provision of airtime to proponents of various political views.

Given the acuteness of the situation, the need to eliminate the political monopolism of any organs of power, political parties, social movements, and individuals in state television and radio broadcasting in the interests of civil peace and public accord, and with the aim of deideologizing state television and radio broadcasting and preventing unconstitutional interference in its activity, as well as creating the right conditions for objective coverage by television and radio broadcasting media of events within the country and abroad, the Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies **decrees:**

1. Until a law on the organization of television and radio broadcasting is adopted in the Russian Federation, the activity of state television and radio broadcasting companies is to be carried out in strict accordance with the present decree and the Russian Federation Law "On the Mass Media". The activity of organs of administration not envisaged in the aforesaid law and its financing is to be discontinued.

Edict No. 1256 of the Russian Federation President "On the 'Rossiya' Federal Television and Radio Broadcasting Service (FTS 'Rossiya')" and Edict No. 1647 "On the Russian Federal Information Center" are to be repealed once the Russian Federal Information Center and the "Rossiya" Federal Television and Radio Broadcasting Service are abolished.

2. To establish that the representative organs of power are cofounders of the state television and radio broadcasting companies established by the relevant organs of executive power. The existing procedure for the financing and material and technical support of state television and radio broadcasting companies is to be retained.

3. To acknowledge as necessary the creation of observation councils by the representative organs of power to ensure freedom of speech in state television and radio broadcasting.

The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet is to elaborate and adopt within two weeks a Provision on Observation Councils, and examine the Russian Federation draft law "On the Organization of Television and Radio Broadcasting" within a month.

4. The main tasks of the observation councils in state television and radio broadcasting are as follows:

to ensure objective coverage of social and political problems and events by state television and radio broadcasting;

to grant various political and other public associations equal opportunities to expound their viewpoints on the economic, social, and political processes taking place in Russia;

to implement the necessary measures to prevent political monopolization of state television and radio broadcasting.

The activity of the observation councils in ensuring freedom of speech in state television and radio broadcasting shall be exercised in accordance with the laws of the Russian Federation and the statute that is being adopted by the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

5. To establish that appointment to office and dismissal from office of leaders of federal state television and radio broadcasting companies is carried out by the Federal Observation Council Ensuring Freedom of Speech in State Television and Radio Broadcasting in conjunction with the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet.

6. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet is instructed to make amendments and addenda to the Russian Federation Law "On the Mass Media" and bring it into line with this decree.

7. The Russian Federation Ministry of Press and Information is to continue to ensure the financing, material and technical provision, and supervision of the financial-economic activity of the state television and radio broadcasting companies.

8. The Russian Federation Supreme Soviet is to introduce into the RSFSR Criminal Code and the RSFSR Code on Administrative Violations within a period of two months the Russian Federation Law "On the Principles of the Taxation System" and other legislative acts involving amendments and addenda in connection with the adoption of the Russian Federation Law "On the Mass Media."

9. The observation councils shall be formed by the delegation of representatives on the principles of parity from all registered factions of the corresponding representative organs of power.

10. The Russian Federation Ministry of Press and Information is to ensure supervision of the unconditional observance of the law in the activity of television and radio companies and other mass media.

11. The present decree comes into effect from the moment it is published.

[Smirnov commentary concludes] Thus two decrees from the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies have been published, one in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, the other in PRAVDA. Which of them has legal force?

Yeltsin Edict on Ostankino TV Stabilization Guarantees

PM0604091193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Edict of the Russian Federation president "On Guarantees for Information Stabilization in the Activity of the 'Ostankino' Russian State Television and Radio Company," signed by Russian Federation President B.N. Yeltsin and dated the Kremlin, Moscow, 2 April 1993]

[Text] With a view to maintaining information stability, pursuing a responsible information policy, and consolidating the legal foundations of the activity of the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company as a unique, unified information and technical complex, and also in connection with the broadening of its functions on the basis of the decision adopted by the CIS Council of Heads of Government 22 January 1993, and in view of the need for its status to be correspondingly broadened on the basis of the principles of international courtesy, cross-border broadcasting, and functional immunity, I decree:

1. The status of television and radio company of international significance is to be imparted to the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company.

2. The appended Statute on the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company is to be ratified.

3. The Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government is to ensure that:

the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company is assigned, in accordance with prescribed procedure and with the right of full economic jurisdiction, the property on its balance sheet as of 1 January 1993;

the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company fully implements cross-border broadcasting, including the use of all the technical facilities and frequencies assigned to this television and radio company as of 1 January 1993 in order to disseminate television and radio programs.

4. In order to use television channel 8 (Moscow), as well as its dissemination network on Russian Federation territory, with a view to providing viewers with cultural enlightenment, educational, and popular science programs, and also specialized programs dealing with the problems of enterprise, land reform, privatization, conversion, the tax system, and banking and insurance activity, the initiative to set up the "Russian Universities" culture organization and television company is to be supported.

The "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company and the All-Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company are instructed to act as founders of the "Russian Universities" television company. The Russian Federation State Committee for the Management of State Property is to provide the requisite assistance for the founders in accordance with Russian Federation legislation.

5. The "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company is to submit within three months for ratification by the Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government proposals to bring into line with current legislation relations between the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Company and enterprises and organizations placed by the Russian Federation Government decree No. 300 of 7 May 1992 "On Support for the Activity of the 'Ostankino' Russian State Television and Radio Company" under this television and radio company's jurisdiction.

6. Point 3 of the Russian Federation president's edict No. 101 of 19 January 1993 "On Imparting the Status of Statewide Television and Radio Company to the All-Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company" is to be deemed invalid.

7. It is laid down that acts previously adopted by the Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government, as well as Russian Federation ministries and departments, defining the legal and property status of the "Ostankino" Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company are valid insofar as they do not contravene the present edict.

8. This edict enters into force from the moment it is published.

[Signed] Russian Federation President B. Yeltsin

[Dated] The Kremlin, Moscow, 2 April 1993

ITAR-TASS Labor Collective Supports Ignatenko

LD0704082593 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0728 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—Four thousand ITAR-TASS staff members have adopted a resolution saying that in conditions of political rivalry and the offensive launched on the freedom of speech by the conservative forces they intend "to stand firm on the positions, recorded in the Russian law on the mass media and the presidential decrees, aimed at protecting the freedom of speech".

Taking into account the will expressed by 26 branches of the news agency, including its correspondents in Russia and abroad, "the ITAR-TASS labour collective is proclaiming its right to be a co-founder of the news agency. It appeals to President Yeltsin and the Russian Government to discuss this issue and adopt a resolution on it."

The ITAR-TASS resolution said as well that the labour collective nominated Vitaliy Ignatenko to the post of director general. The resolution was adopted at the general meeting by the overwhelming majority of votes, with one vote against and three abstaining.

Minister Calls For Journalistic Professionalism

LD0604110893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0950 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakov]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—Russia's Ministry of Press and Information opened its "Culture of Free Journalism" program today with a meeting between members of the Constitutional Court and journalists. Minister Mikhail Fedotov told the ITAR-TASS correspondent that at the heart of the program is the following idea: "Laws alone are insufficient for freedom of the press; What is also needed is the culture of a society living in conditions of press freedom."

The minister's view is that this quality assumes on the one hand that journalists have the relevant professional culture, and on the other hand that those who have dealings with the press should be a part of that culture, having normal relations with the press and a normal perception of press activities. Even trifling things reveal the lack of this culture in the press, the minister says. Misprints abound on the pages of newspapers. It is becoming the norm to use a so-called "substandard" lexicon—or quite simply, four-letter words.

"This has nothing whatsoever to do with press freedom," Mikhail Fedotov said. "Everyone can be criticized, but not in any form." And it is not a matter of "ideological censorship." We do, after all, have a law on protecting the rights of consumers. There are millions of newspaper and television consumers and they must be given a "quality product," the minister is convinced.

Economic Issues

Gerashchenko Not To Resign Unless Supreme Soviet Agrees

LD0704113393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 0425 GMT 7 Apr 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Excerpt] I am only prepared to resign if the Supreme Soviet agrees that I should. This is what Russian Central Bank Chairman Viktor Gerashchenko said in an interview with RIA. Russian Federation Vice Premier Boris Fedorov said he is insisting on Gerashchenko's resignation because the Central Bank is sabotaging the government's decisions on credit and finance policy. [passage omitted]

Implications of Doubling Minimum Wage Viewed

PM0604085593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 8

["Editorial Viewpoint" article: "Doubling Wages Does Not Mean Doubling Income"]

[Text] As of 1 April a law entered into force whereby the minimum wage in Russia is nearly doubled: From 2,250 rubles [R] to R4,275 a month. Under President B. Yeltsin's edict on the same topic the minimum wage increases to R4,500 but only in budget-funded sectors. The first document should probably be understood to mean that henceforth no one in Russia has the right to pay anyone less than R4,275 for a full month's work. The second document regulates minimum wages exclusively for workers in state institutions and budget-funded organizations.

Correct and timely decisions, as we say in our country, but at the same time we should notify our fellow citizens who have the misfortune to live on their wages alone, and minimum wages at that, that doubling wages does not mean at all that you will have twice as much real money. Inflation by the end of April, that is by the time of the first payment, will snip off a levy of about 15 percent from your increment and the same amount from your former basic wage.

In addition the doubling of the minimum wage automatically shifts the entire scale of payments in the state sector and very soon teachers, doctors, and other representatives of that sector will one way or another restore the differential which has so far existed between their income and the minimum wage, and that together with the already doubled minimum wages will drastically increase the amount of money in circulation.

Taxation policy is also attached to the minimum wage, and many payments into the budget calculated depending on the number of minimum wages will be substantially reduced.

The increase in effective supply with a parallel increase in the budget deficit will yet again encourage inflation, which will rapidly swallow up the increment.

And if the different branches of power continue to compete in attracting electors' votes with the aid of additional payments, as is happening now, then inflation could not only eat up the increment, but also make real incomes sink lower than before.

It is very hard to break out of the vicious spiral race of prices, wages, and prices. Various political forces see a way out of the situation which has emerged in the most diverse directions. Reform does not guarantee success but it gives a chance. Halting it guarantees the majority of society a hopeless minimal living standard, far lower than was the case before it all began.

Raise Seen as Pre-Referendum 'Populism'

PM0704100793 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Viktor Khatuntsev "Leader": "The Kind of Government That We Have"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Recently a presidential edict raised minimum pay in the budget-funded sectors to 4,500 rubles [R]. But the legislators set their own level—R4,275. This would seem a noble thing to do given the crazy way that prices are rising, because basic wage rates, pensions, and grants are based on the minimum rate of pay—so you can expect extra in your pockets. The only thing that I would like to know is how far is this a case of populism on the eve of the referendum? And why this particular level? There is no particular cause for rejoicing here because such gifts are very much fraught with critical consequences.

Unpredictability—that is the danger underlying politicians' actions. Last year no one foresaw the crisis of payments and cash which fueled prices and led to skulduggery in the banks. This year there will be something else even if only because of those pay raises or the disruption to sowing work because of the absence of fuel.

The inability to foresee, calculate, or envisage on the part of a statesman means incompetence. And those who in the heady days of reforms pinned their hopes on the Gaydar team have probably seen for themselves that education and economic erudition still mean nothing. Chernomyrdin argues "against stupidity in privatization" but it seems that the government in general does not know what to do with the redistribution of property that has begun.

Such are the authorities for you. Such are the rulers of a once mighty power. Such is the level. And even if someone is encouraged to resign they do not let him go. Gaydar, who was dismissed, has had an institute set up for him while Poltoranin has been given a powerful information center.

But the Russian people this year have been given a 70 percent increase in prices and the further likelihood that nothing is going to change for the better. Look and you will see another reformer admitting with hindsight that many things were done wrong. The age-old refrain and there is no end to it.

Gasoline Prices in Moscow To Double 7 Apr

OW0704011793 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1714 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Gasoline prices in Moscow and the Moscow region are to rise by 100 percent from Wednesday, April 7, following instructions by the Mayor of Moscow and Chief Administrator of the Moscow Region. Ai-92 and Ai-76 grades will now cost Rbl [ruble] 80 and Rbl 70 per litre respectively. Diesel fuel - Rbl 65 per litre. Fuel oil will cost the city's Mosenergo company Rbl 18,000 a ton, but other customers will have to pay Rbl 25,000 a ton.

A spokesman for the Mayor's Office said the city and regional authorities were forced to take the measure following notification about oil price rises from Russia's oil-producing regions.

The Social Security Committee in Moscow is planning to review compensation for gasoline and car servicing for some categories of city residents.

Gold Stock 'Replenished,' Totals 308 Tonnes

LD0604174793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1716 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Pavel Gordeyev]

[Text] Moscow April 6 TASS—The Russian gold stock amounts to 308 tonnes, First Deputy Head of the Russian State Committee for Precious Metals Yuriy Kotlyar told ITAR-TASS today.

In his words, all the 308 tonnes are kept in special storages of the Russian Central Bank. After almost ten-time reduction of Russian precious metal sales since 1991, its stock has considerably increased. The gold stock replenished by 28 tonnes over 1992 alone.

Article Views Cabinet's Economic Record

PM0504115193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 3 Apr 93 p 1

[Yuriy Rytov "Editorial Viewpoint": "One Hundred Days in Power and Without Power Since Parliamentarians Are Striving To Assume All State Executive Functions, Wresting Them From the Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin signed an edict on the membership of the country's government 23 December 1992.

Cadres

The changes to the membership of the government were—on a universal scale—negligible. Vice Premier Valeriy Makharadze was not included in the new Cabinet. But Yuriy Yarov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, became a new vice premier (thus, in my view, Viktor Chernomyrdin wanted to underline his desire for normal cooperation with the legislature).

The appointment of Boris Fedorov as vice premier and the country's main financier requires no particular comment. We all well remember him storming out of Silayev's cabinet since he disagreed with the economic and financial policy being implemented by the premier. Now he has reappeared, convinced of the need for economic reforms and the benefit of his influencing this process.

Chernomyrdin's "team" can hardly be said to be Gaydar's "team." Georgiy Khizha has taken up one of the key posts in the new Cabinet, a highly experienced production man and pragmatist.

It can be said with certainty that it is this kind of pragmatic "down-to-earth" line that will distinguish Viktor Chernomyrdin's policy from that of his predecessor Yegor Gaydar, while retaining the integral course of economic reform.

Vain Efforts

What tasks has the new Cabinet set itself? There are no policy documents on this score. Admittedly early this year Boris Fedorov submitted a report entitled "On Russian Financial and Economic Policy in 1993." However this document designed to financially stabilize and strengthen the rate of the ruble lost all importance after the federal budget was approved (more about that later).

Another fundamental document was formulated deep within the Ministry for the Economy—the "Program of Urgent Measures To Improve the Economic Situation." It weighed in at roughly 1 kg. However, there have been tremendous doubts over the suitability of this formulation since Andrey Nechayev resigned.

Consequently, we can only judge the government's intentions from the few statements made by the premier. The following conclusions can be drawn by analyzing the crux of these statements.

Having confirmed his commitment to economic reform, Viktor Chernomyrdin has repeatedly stressed that he wants more pragmatic, realistic, "down-to-earth" approaches to it. In particular, he hopes to restore the necessary level of state administration of the state sector of the economy to ensure it reaches a stable position.

The number two task (the sequence is arbitrary since all the tasks are of equal priority) is financial stabilization. Task number three is to increase the social orientation of reform.

Without a Budget

What has Chernomyrdin's cabinet succeeded in doing in its 100 days in office? A plan of fundamental measures encompassing 100 wide-ranging tasks has been compiled. An examination of specific economic issues is scheduled for March or April. The fundamentals of new industrial policy have been formulated.

Regrettably, only in rare instances have the decisions adopted by the government been carried out. The following example can be cited for interest's sake. Production enterprises have not so far received the 200 billion rubles [R] in subsidies for the restoration of the oil and gas complex approved by the parliament last December at the premier's request.

Something equally strange has happened to the ratification of the federal budget. The parliament only ratified it 25 March—for virtually the whole of the first quarter the government worked "blind," without knowing how much money it could spend and how much it might receive. What is more, the draft budget request became cluttered up with 200 amendments in parliament, of which only 118 got a hearing. The upshot is that republic budget expenditure was increased by R3.8 trillion, and income cut by R1 trillion. Thus, the budget deficit reached the fantastic amount of R9.8 trillion.

Naturally, when speaking at the Eighth Congress of People's Deputies, Viktor Chernomyrdin asked for the necessary conditions to be created for the government to work normally. I stress: He did not demand emergency powers, just the right to take the actions that have always been characteristic of governments everywhere, in all civilized countries. You will remember, esteemed readers, that all his requests (demands, wishes) were rejected.

By and large the first quarter has been accompanied by fierce, political battles. And we have involuntarily analyzed less and less the real economic processes on which the population's standard of living effectively depends.

The Conclusion

There is one solution—to untie the government's hands and grant it the right to make autonomous decisions and autonomously extricate the economy from crisis. And continue the economic reforms with their social amendments.

Former Minister Andrey Nechayev Interviewed

MK0604093093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 4

[Interview with Andrey Nechayev by Olga Krushelnitskaya published in "Government" column: "Andrey Nechayev: 'I Do Not Fit Into the New Team.' The Minister Was Not Persistent Enough"]

[Text] Andrey Nechayev has changed his job. He will now head the Russian Financial Corporation. On behalf of the state he will engage in selecting enterprises and regions for priority projects and provision of credits. The organization's guarantee of success lies in the experience and expertise of its leader. These subjects were discussed during the interview.

[Krushelnitskaya] Andrey Alekseyevich, you have lost a ministerial position. What is your attitude to this?

[Nechayev] I take a philosophical attitude. When I got involved in politics, I knew what I was doing.

[Krushelnitskaya] Why did this happen?

[Nechayev] I think that at present the premier, just like everybody else, is very much concerned that the government has largely lost the levers to administer and control the economic situation. We have no coordinating center whose role could be played by the Economy Ministry. Apparently I do not fit into the premier's idea of a leader who could exercise the role of coordinator.

Moreover, someone has to assume the blame for the present situation. It is not only the Economy and Finance Ministries, however, that are responsible for this....

[Krushelnitskaya] Do you think you did everything possible?

[Nechayev] I have some reason to be satisfied professionally. I do not mean of course that output has fallen in the country, but that the pattern of economic thinking has changed, and this is paramount. We have completely moved away, for instance, from state production orders. We have moved away from the centralized distribution of resources. We have moved away from price controls and from a foreign trade monopoly. Other economic levers have appeared: investment credits and a new tax system.

[Krushelnitskaya] But we have many potential entrepreneurs who up to now cannot fully reveal their potential. Was it not possible to help them by removing superfluous obstacles?

[Nechayev] Let's not us mix up the existence of laws and their practical application. After all, the traditional habits of the state's middle and lower administrative levels have remained the same. To register an enterprise, for example, all the laws are in place. But if a person is forced to go from one office to another endlessly, if he is being coerced into giving a bribe, the law is powerless here. The same refers to private farmers. If they are allotted land plots in a forest or far away from their house, there is no need to pass a new law—it is necessary to dismiss the local leaders and to create the kind of conditions that allow them to work properly. The only thing is that this cannot be done from above. It is necessary for the farmers to unite and demand that their rights be defended. After all, it is impossible to send an inspector or controller to each village.

[Krushelnitskaya] What hindered you in your work?

[Nechayev] Lately sectoral and regional lobbyism has strengthened very much. Attempts to obtain privileges for individual sectors without consideration for the general state of things have intensified. I am talking about a number of decrees on agriculture that have been issued and are currently at the discussion stage. There have been numerous attempts on the part of sectoral committees and on the part of government members in charge of particular areas of activity to obtain as many resources as possible, not always for a good reason. The regions are not lagging behind either. In my time I was among the initiators of the idea that their rights be expanded as broadly as possible. Here, however, I think we failed to take one thing into account—a shortage of decency. And so today local authorities are constantly demanding now money, now export quotas, regardless of how the situation is shaping up in the country, trying to resolve their own problems at somebody else's expense. To the best of my ability I was trying to counteract this trend. This is how a conflict situation is born.

Unfortunately, the situation in the country is such that apart from the requisite expansion of the regions' rights, quite often political overtures are being made. An exception made for someone immediately brings about a whole string of similar claims. Everybody is closely watching so as not to lag behind his neighbor.

[Krushelnitakaya] Did you make any mistakes that you now regret?

[Nechayev] Without them I would still be a minister. I have not always been insistent enough in proving my case. For example, the decision on reassessing basic assets and amortization was taken too late, which considerably thwarted investment activity. We should also have moved over to selective support of production earlier. Well, what is the use of talking about it now....

[Krushelnitakaya] Do you think that your successor in the present conditions would be able to make sure that things change for the better?

[Nechayev] Much depends on how he goes about it. I think that basically the government's fields of activity in the last two or three months have been correct. Therefore, if a coordinated policy is hammered out between the government and the Central Bank, it will still be possible to radically improve the situation within a few months.

Supreme Soviet

Chairman Khasbulatov on Conflict With Yeltsin

*PM0604151893 Lisbon EXPRESSO in Portuguese
3 Apr 93 p B 5*

[Interview with Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov by Global Viewpoint journalist Mikhail Bruk in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Ruslan Khasbulatov is better known for being President Boris Yeltsin's main rival, than for his ideas. In an exclusive interview granted at the White House in Moscow, he explains the reasons for his estrangement from his former ally, and gives his version of the events which have been shaking Russia. For those who are accustomed to hearing Yeltsin's arguments, Khasbulatov's statements are the other side of the coin and help us understand a great deal of what is at issue in the current power struggle.

[Bruk] How do you see the course of events after these days of tension in Russia?

[Khasbulatov] On the horizon, I see the silhouette of a dictator. At the end of last week's Congress session, I told the deputies that the most important thing was to defend the democratic principle which we now have, because there is currently a backward movement in our democracy in the direction of personal power. We must be alert to a possible coup. The dictatorship could be communist, but it could also be anticommunist. Our people are weary of dictatorship and fear its return. That is why, if the Western leaders really wish to assist Russia's rebirth as a democratic state, they must reflect very seriously before choosing the personalities whom they intend to support.

[Bruk] What is your opinion of the coming summit between Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin?

[Khasbulatov] I believe that it will not be a very important meeting for the Russian people. It has little to do with real life. The more calls to support Yeltsin that come from the West, including the United States, the more our people reject them, because they believe that they are interference in our internal affairs. I honestly fear that this could lead to the explosion of an anti-American movement.

[Bruk] What kind of Western aid would be useful for you?

[Khasbulatov] We need considerable foreign investment, but we know that large-scale investments are not to be expected until we have consolidated the rule-of-law state. I doubt that foreign investment will come or be useful until parliament succeeds in creating a legal framework for it.

We did not receive a single bill to facilitate foreign investment from the reformist government of Prime Minister Yegor Gaydar (resigned last year—EXPRESSO editor's note). Although Gaydar was a wonderful propagandist, who went on television to tell fairy tales about the economic marvels which his government was creating, the sorry truth is that he ruined everything.

When there is a stable rule-of-law state, then the West will be able to help us train skilled workers for the banks and other commercial activities—especially for the small and medium-sized enterprises.

[Bruk] The military did not intervene during the tension of the past few days. In what circumstances do you foresee the possibility of a military intervention in order to try to stabilize the situation?

[Khasbulatov] If there is bloodshed, it will be as a result of President Yeltsin's call for rebellion. Let us consider how everything happened. The president's television address in which he demanded special powers violated 10 articles of the Constitution. When he saw the unfavorable reaction of the Constitutional Court and the population to his address, he changed what he had said when he issued the formal decree four days later, but the president's colleagues are so illiterate that three articles of the Constitution are violated even in the new decree.

For the Congress of People's Deputies, this was the last straw. It infuriated them, and they voted on the president's impeachment. We had 617 votes in favor, but we needed another 70 in order to win. What worries me most in all this is that the president has constantly tried to condemn the Constitutional Court and dispute its rulings.

Our president was an important leader of the Communist Party for three decades, and became a Central Committee secretary. For the CPSU secretaries, there were no laws. Unfortunately, our president has kept the old habits and almost declared war on democratic institutions which wish to oppose the illegality of the system of decrees to which he was accustomed.

And why does he believe that he can continue to violate the Constitution? Because he is personally supported by Western leaders? When Yeltsin adopts a stance, he justifies it by saying: "I am supported by the Western leaders; I trust in their aid."

What will be the Western leaders' attitude if there is bloodshed?

[Bruk] But do the current Constitution and representative institutions have any democratic legitimacy, since they were created before the collapse of communism?

[Khasbulatov] I know that the idea is being foisted on the West that there is only one democrat in Russia—Boris Yeltsin, whose hands are tied by a communist Constitution and parliament. This is complete nonsense. Yeltsin is not struggling against a few conservatives, nostalgic for communism. Communism will never again return to Russia. The people rejected communism, without needing either Yeltsin or the West.

Boris Yeltsin was not born president of Russia; he was elected "on the basis of the current Constitution." When he took office, he swore to defend that Constitution. The point here is that he must abide by the law until the law is changed in accordance with the only constitutional means at our disposal—not by force or by a unilateral decree of the executive. The Constitution which people say has no legitimacy was already largely amended in 1990, when we were elected.

[Bruk] What if President Yeltsin wins the 25 April referendum?

[Khasbulatov] The law must always prevail. Nothing else. No illegalities must occur. Yeltsin contradicts himself. He said that if he loses the referendum, he will tender his resignation. If he wins, he says that parliament will be unable to call into question his actions as president until the end of his term. But why will his position be legitimate then, but not ours? Both he and we were elected when Russia was still part of the USSR. Certainly, the Russian people would have voted differently if the circumstances had also been different. That is why I still believe that the best way to resolve the issue of legitimacy, now that Russia is an independent state, is to call early and simultaneous elections for the presidency and for parliament.

[Bruk] Former Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze says that he can smell civil war in the air. Do you believe that there really is a danger of Russia breaking up?

[Khasbulatov] We hoped that the president would become a kind of father figure for the Russian multinational state and give everything some meaning, but we have reached the conclusion that he has done the opposite, with initiatives which could lead to Russia's division and collapse.

To give just one instance, consider the decree which confers special powers on the Cossacks living in the area between the northern Caucasus and southern Russia. Throughout their history, the Cossacks have fought the population of southern Russia. Now the population of the northern Caucasus are very worried about the fact that the president is arming the Cossacks and restoring the strength which they had in the 18th century.

This week I was visited by delegations from four republics in that region, who told me: "Separatism is increasingly strong. Reactionary forces have emerged which wish to arm our citizens and unite the population of the northern mountains, separating them from Russia in order to fight against the Cossacks, whom the president supports." And when giving these Cossacks support, President Yeltsin told them that they should "crush the representative authorities."

There are also Cossacks in Kazakhstan who are rebelling against their leader—an intelligent and wise man. And there are Cossacks in the Urals who wish to impose their law. Leaders and deputies of other republics of the former USSR have come to meet with me in order to tell me: "Look, your animosity in Russia is penetrating our countries. It is being spread by Russian television and is causing insecurity among us."

Such is the instability. Just a year ago, the federal treaty uniting Russia was signed at my insistence and that of other members of parliament. The president and his people have never taken part in that project. It is thanks to that treaty alone that the Russian Federation has withstood the challenges inflicted on it by Boris Yeltsin's irresponsible decrees.

[Bruk] You and President Yeltsin used to be allies. How do you explain the acrimony which has developed between you?

[Khasbulatov] I agreed to be speaker of the Russian parliament after a week of urging from Yeltsin, in October 1990. It took a great deal of urging, because I do not like the role of arbiter between warring factions in such a charged atmosphere.

Shortly before the Congress began its work in October and Yeltsin took office, the president began to issue decrees which were not in keeping with the legislation. I told him at that time: "Boris Nikolayevich, you are on the wrong track: Your decrees are incorrect; they cannot replace the Constitution, however unsatisfactory it may be at this time of reforms." Nobody knew it, but even then we were having heated arguments about the way he was handling the matter of legality. It was the beginning of our conflict.

When the time came for me to be elected as speaker of parliament by the deputies, Yeltsin did not support me. After the August 1991 coup was thwarted, the president's tendency to govern by decree became even clearer.

Good or bad, it is the law which we have. It does not matter whether I like the Constitution, or whether or not Yeltsin likes it; what matters is that it is the basic law. That was and is my opinion, but he does not share it. That is the main reason for the conflict between the two of us. You cannot change everything by decree. The legislators must examine the pros and cons; you cannot just go and stir up the crowds. That is why I am opposed to this rash attitude adopted by President Yeltsin.

Plan for 'Protection Department' Criticized

PM0604151593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Article by Professor Valeriy Savitskiy, doctor of Juridical Sciences: "Protection Department?"]

[Text] The Congress, forced to concede to the arbitration of the people in its confrontation with the president, had barely ended before the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet Presidium took steps which cannot be described as doing anything but continuing to fuel tension. Once again it demonstrated its total freedom to act without consideration for the commands contained in existing laws. At a closed session the presidium examined documents linked with the creation of a Supreme Soviet Protection Department [departament okhrany].

The draft statute on this department says that it is a special subunit under the Supreme Soviet. It operates as a federal state protection body within the security forces [sily obsepecheniya bezopasnosti], directly performing state protection of Russian Federation representative bodies and their officials. This host of menacing terms should evidently underline the department's special role in protecting legislators against the dangers threatening them from all quarters.

And this role is indeed unique. It turns out that the department is to predict and expose threats to protection installations' vital interests, keep protection forces and facilities in readiness, organize special measures to ensure the security of the people under protection during special [osobyy] (?) periods, and concern itself with the mobilization readiness (?) of protection subunits. This is really like a document from a combat operations deployment headquarters.

The department's powers match its role. It "eliminates... any circumstances impeding state security" (one is kind of awestruck at this frank wording). The department autonomously authorizes its personnel to store and carry weapons and special gear. If necessary, it collaborates with foreign states' special services. Its autonomy or, more precisely, lack of checks [beskontrolnost] exceeds all conceivable and inconceivable bounds since the department is entitled to conclude contracts to be supplied with arms, special hardware, and communications systems. What other establishment in the country has such powers?

What of the fact that the Law on Operational Investigation Activity does not mention a Supreme Soviet protection department? If it is necessary to monitor mail shipments, eavesdrop on telephone conversations, and so on, do so, then we will amend the law. Does the Code of Criminal Procedure not recognize such an investigative body as the department? That is not important: Institute criminal proceedings, conduct examinations, searches, expert checks, and other procedural activities limiting citizens' constitutional rights and we will amend the code. We have learned nothing if not to continually change and supplement the Constitution and the laws.

The structure of the department is conceived on a grand scale. There is a professional training center (you can imagine the number of personnel if that kind of center is needed), a parliamentary (?) militia department, and a branch to combat economic offenses (something like the former Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation Department? Only who is it to combat—can it possibly be deputies?).

Needless to say, the people compiling the draft have not forgotten concessions and privileges for the legislators' guards. It is not the internal minister but the department director himself who will confer special ranks on command personnel, including the rank of colonel. For "special conditions (?) of service" provision is made for concessions in the procedure for calculating length of service, allowance payments, medical services, and so on.

So, an elite paramilitary detachment is being formed under the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, a detachment whose functions far exceed those of guards. This is to all intents and purposes a combat subunit, totally subordinate to the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Given the current confrontation between the branches of power the creation of the protection department arouses nothing but disquiet.

To conclude I must point out a curious detail. The document envisages setting up within the department a section for the protection of the Russian Federation General Prosecutor's Office. There you have truly fatherly concern for this department—not only to appoint its head and direct its work, but also to provide it with reliable protection. All that remains is to place the judiciary under protection (or tutelage), and onward we go to a rule-of-law state!

New Arm Created To Expand Influence on Regions

MK0704083093 Moscow KOMMERSANT-DAILY in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 9

[Aleksandr Pisarev report: "New Supreme Soviet Apparatus Department Created. Parliament Intends To Interact Actively With Regions"]

[Text] The branches of state power, locked in conflict between themselves, are ever more actively looking for ways to influence the regions. Today, as was promised in its 3 April issue, KOMMERSANT-DAILY gives an account of a new unit created within the Supreme Soviet apparatus:

The Department [otdel] for Federative and Interethnic Relations

Nikolay Medvedev, who until recently led the Supreme Soviet Commission for Questions of the National-State Structure and Interethnic Relations, has been appointed to lead the new department. Mr. Medvedev told your KOMMERSANT-DAILY correspondent that the idea for the new department had first emerged at the time the Federation Treaty was signed, but for a number of reasons it was not carried out during the year that since elapsed. However, the growing role of regional representatives during the recent congresses and the de facto creation of the Federation Council spurred the leaders of parliament to create a department whose function would be to coordinate relations between the federal bodies of power and Federation members.

According to Nikolay Medvedev, the department, created by Ruslan Khasbulatov's directive, will do more than deal with questions of interaction between parliament and the Federation Council. Among its tasks will also be the coordination of "legislative initiative from below," and the solution of problems of interaction between regional authorities and central ministries and departments. The unit will also be working on a draft law on the implementation of the Federation Treaty, and on acts regulating legal questions affecting the powers of components of the federation and of the federal bodies of power. Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Nikolay Ryabov has become supervisor of the new department.

Faction Calls For Public To Back Yeltsin

LD0604155693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1422 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliament correspondent Yuriy Filippov]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The parliamentary faction "Accord for Progress" [Soglasiye radi progressa] has called on Russians to "participate most actively in the referendum on 25 April," because they "are capable of giving an impetus toward overcoming the political crisis in Russia."

A statement by the faction which was circulated here today stresses that if there is a vote of no confidence in Boris Yeltsin during the referendum, this will open "the way for the most aggressive forces of the opposition" and for the restoration of "the old regime in new ideological packaging."

Regional Affairs

Blast Causes 'Radioactive Contamination' in Tomsk

LD0604113993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1110 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Veronika Romanenkova]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—At 0900 [0500 GMT] a tank containing an industrial uranium solution of medium-level radioactivity exploded at the Siberian Chemical Combine (Tomsk-7). As a result of the blast, the roof caught fire, though this has already been put out. The accident caused no casualties. The ITAR-TASS correspondent learned this at the Russian Federation Ministry of Atomic Energy press service.

This emergency has led to radioactive contamination around the factory over an area of several hundred square meters. The radiation level at the epicenter of the explosion is several roentgen per hour, and over the contaminated area several milliroentgen per hour. Other installations at the Siberian Chemical Combine and housing estates have not been exposed to contamination and are out of danger. The aftermath of the accident is still being cleared up, and in particular, de-activation of the area has begun. The causes of the blast are as yet unknown.

Assessed as '3d Level' Accident

OW0604180593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1708 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to the international scale, the explosion of a tank filled with a solution of radioactive substances, which occurred at one of the plants of the Siberian chemical complex in Tomsk-7 (Western Siberia), is assessed as "a serious incident or an accident of the 3rd level," the press center of the Russian Atomic Energy Ministry reported to Interfax.

The tank contained a uranium industrial solution, the press center asserts. The explosion took place in the absence of personnel. A fire broke out on the plant's roof.

The fire has been put out, no casualties are reported.

The press center of the Atomic Energy Ministry reports that radioactive contamination of the roof and of the territory surrounding the building, accounting for several hundred square meters, occurred as a result of this explosion. The level of radioactive contamination fluctuates from several reontgen/hour in the ground zero to several millireontgen/hour on the territory in the vicinity of the building. Other buildings of the chemical plant were not subjected to radioactive contamination. The explosion has not endangered the settlements in the region of the plant.

The radioactive leakage which followed the explosion was directed by the wind to an unpopulated area. The radiation level on the border of the sanitarian-protection zone constitutes 3-4 millireontgen per hour; according to a representative of the press service, "this does not present any threat to the health of the population." Measures to localize the catastrophe are underway.

A special commission to investigate the cause of the explosion and a headquarters to liquidate the aftermath of the accident have been created at the plant.

The Tomsk provincial headquarters of civil defense reconfirmed to Interfax that there is no danger to the population. The wind is blowing in the opposite direction of Tomsk. The whole protection system of the radio-chemical plant is in a state of alert. The rescue service of the Siberian chemical complex is participating in the liquidation of the accident and the headquarters asserts that it is successfully fulfilling its tasks.

Contamination Levels Reported

LD0604204293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1940 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Apr—ITAR-TASS was informed by the press service of the State Committee for Emergency Situations that as of 2000, there were six mobile detachments of civil defense troops operating in the area of the accident at the Siberian chemical combine in the town of Tomsk-7. According to data from the investigators, the level of radioactivity at the site of the explosion is 30 milliroentgens per hour. At a distance of 19 kilometers to the northeast it is about 40 milliroentgens per hour. The estimated area of radioactive contamination is 1,000 hectares.

Checks are being carried out of the personnel of the military fire fighting unit of the chemical combine which helped extinguish the fire. The maximum total dose of radiation received by any of the personnel does not exceed 0.6 roentgen.

An operational headquarters has been set up in Tomsk under the leadership of Administrative Chief V. Kress. An operational group of the Russian Federation's state committee for civil defense, emergency situations, and the elimination of the aftermath of natural disasters will fly to the site tomorrow morning to investigate the causes and the possible consequences of the accident.

Journalists Allowed Access

LD0704080293 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Text] Our correspondent Andrey Murashev reports over the phone on the details of the accident at the Siberian Chemicals Combine in the town of Tomsk-7.

[Murashev] It all happened on 6 April during lunch break, at 1258 hours local time. For this reason, thankfully, there were no victims of the blast in the first shop of the radio-chemical works. The causes of the incident still have to be investigated by a state commission that has been specially set up. But it was recorded on instruments that for a period of six minutes some kind of chemical reaction occurred in the apparatus with a capacity of 34 cubic meters in which the waste from uranium production is prepared for purificiation, as a result of which there was a blast, the force of which destroyed the apparatus itself and the roof of the shop. There was a discharge of uranium spray into the atmosphere. The level of radioactive contamination on the grounds of the works exceeded the maximum permitted norm 20-fold. Traces of the discharge have been recorded at a 3-kilometer radius from the center. But let me note that this whole area lies inside the sanitary protection zone of the Siberian Chemicals Combine.

The oblast and town committees for ecology have taken urgent measures to monitor the ecological situation.

Observations have been taken since the time of the blast in all directions from the center. And at 0620 hours local time on 7 April, employees of the mobile laboratory of the Sanitary and Epidemiological Supervision Center discovered a strip about one kilometer wide stretching to the north from the combine for a distance of approximately 15 kilometers. This is a forest on the opposite side from the town. Within this strip, the radiation level fluctuates between 50 and 400 microroentgens per hour. The intensive decontamination of this area is being carried out.

As for the situation in the towns of Tomsk and Tomsk-7 and also in villages around the Siberian Chemicals Combine, the background radiation level there is below the maximum norms.

At the works, repair work is under way on the destroyed shop. I was told by the works administration no extra manpower will be required for this. Reinforcements were only required by the team of radiation supervisors. Journalists have been granted unimpeded access to the facility.

'Contradictory' Reports on Radiation

OW0704101593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0953 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to preliminary reports, the accident at the Siberian chemical plant in the closed city of Tomsk-7 on Tuesday [6 April] was caused by a thermal chemical explosion in a 28 cubic meter tank containing the solution of substances for processing used nuclear fuel, the press service of the Russian Federation's State Nuclear Inspection Committee told INTERFAX on April 7.

No traces of sustainable chain reaction, i.e. nuclear explosion, had been found, the committee's representative said. In the tank there were substances of medium activity. According to preliminary reports, the area outside the sanitary zone was not seriously contaminated.

To quote this official, the explosion destroyed part of the roof and partially damaged the chemical plant's production facilities. Reports about the radiation level received in the morning April 7 are contradictory.

Tomsk-7 is located 20 kilometers north of the regional center of Tomsk.

'No Need To Evacuate'

LD0704123293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Correspondent N. Pavlov report; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Georgiy Kaurov, head of the department for public relations and information, held a news conference today at the Ministry of Atomic Energy on the details of the explosion at the chemical combine in the closed town of Tomsk-7. Tanks containing spent nuclear fuel to be reprocessed exploded. One of the plant's nuclear reactors is still working, supplying heat to the town of Tomsk. The incident has been assessed by experts as a three on the seven-point scale. A total of 1,000 meters of the territory has been contaminated as a result of the accident. Two more contaminated spots have been discovered at a distance of 10 km from the epicenter, where the background radiation level is 10 times above the norm. Asked by a "Vesti" correspondent about the level of danger, Georgiy Kaurov said:

[Begin Kaurov recording] This accident is practically of no danger. [end recording]

In his words, there were no casualties at the moment of the explosion and the fire was put out by workers at the plant. As for residential areas around the combine, in the opinion of the Atomic Energy Ministry staff member, there is no need to evacuate people from the area. Work at the site of the accident is continuing to establish the causes of the accident.

'Most Serious Incident' Since Chernobyl

LD0704103593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1008 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Igor Ivantsov]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—The accident at the Siberian Chemical Combine is the most serious incident in the country's atomic energy sector since Chernobyl, Georgiy Kaurov, chief of the Information Directorate of the Ministry of Atomic Energy of the Russian Federation, told journalists today. However, this gives no grounds whatsoever for comparing its scale with that of Chernobyl. In his words, on the seven-point international accident assessment scale, it reached level "three," which signifies "a serious incident without irradiation of staff, or a nondangerous [besopasnaya] accident."

Emergency Committee Dispatches Team

OW0704103693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1020 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A team from the State Emergency Committee has left for Tomsk-7 to investigate the causes and consequences of an explosion of a uranium solution tank in a Siberian chemical works. An ad hoc team has also been set up locally. According to the Atomic Energy Ministry, the explosion fell into the category of "a serious incident or a third-level emergency" in the international scale.

Six mobile civil defense units are active in the area. No casualties have been reported because the explosion occurred while the tank was unattended.

The press office of the State of Emergency Committee reported that a preliminary measurement had revealed the radioactive contamination at the explosion site to be 30 mR/h [millireontgen per hour] and, 19 km to the north-east, about 40 mR/h. The contamination is estimated to cover an area of 1,000 hectares.

Military fire fighters from the chemical works who extinguished the fire are now undergoing medical checks. The maximum radiation received by the firemen is 0.6 R [reontgen].

Emergency Team Continues Work

LD0704120193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1056 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—The work of the operational group of the Russian State Committee for Emergency Situations continues at the scene of the accident at the Tomsk radio-chemical works for the processing of nuclear fuel. As an ITAR-TASS correspondent learned from Marina Ryklina, head of the State Committee for Emergency Situations, it has by now been established that one of the devices exploded at the penultimate stage of waste processing and that a localized discharge occurred through a ventilation pipe. During the accident, fortunately, there was a wind which blew the radioactive spot [pyatno] in the direction of the woods. The population centers have not been affected.

A radioactive spot has been detected 6 km from the site, and the length of the trail is 900 meters. The contamination level of the spot does not exceed five milliroentgen an hour. The polluted area in the region totals 1,000 square meters. During the accident one of the workers received a dose of radiation under 0.6 rems. This is permissible for personnel at these sites. The radiation level at the scene of the accident ranges from 1 roentgen up to several milliroentgens an hour. At present the polluted areas are being decontaminated. Snow and soil at the scene of the accident are being collected and evacuated for burial. Experts are monitoring the state of the atmosphere. On 8 April a government commission is expected to arrive in Tomsk-7.

In reply to a question by an ITAR-TASS correspondent whether experts from the Military Academy for Chemical Defense have been invited to work on eliminating the consequences, one of his leaders said that neither the Defense Ministry leadership nor the government have issued any orders to that effect.

Village Affected; 'Cloud' Spreading

LD0704122293 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 7 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] [Komarova] Journalists of the Tomsk TV studio have got in contact with the bureau to report the details of the accident at the Tomsk chemical works:

[Correspondent Raisa Alekseyeva, reporting by telephone] There was a chemical discharge at 0840 hours Moscow time from the Siberian Chemical Combine, which is in our closed town of Tomsk-7, as the result of an accident at Facility 15. The combine's specialists assert that the level of contamination has spread mainly at the facility's technological site.

However, it transpired today that some territory near the village of (?Samus) has also been affected by the contamination. There, the background radiation is about 400 milliroentgen, which is 20 times the daily norm. Traffic to and from the village has been halted and snow is being gathered.

At a session of the civil defense headquarters held half an hour ago, it was stated that the population of the oblast center and also the town of Tomsk-7 have nothing to worry about. The background radiation is within the norm.

One further unpleasant detail. Anti-aircraft defense forces today discovered a cloud to the northeast of Tomsk. It is radioactive in nature, but its composition is as yet unknown. It is situated at a height of 2 kilometers and is moving at a speed of 36 kilometers per hour in the direction of Yeniseysk.

Contamination Extends Beyond Tomsk

LD0704142693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1349 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Anna Bakina]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—The radiation contamination which resulted from yesterday's blast at the Siberian Chemical Combine (Tomsk-7) has gone beyond the bounds of the enterprise's territory. The radiation level within a 1.5 kilometer radius of the epicenter of the blast was 3-4 milliroentgens per hour today. The ITAR-TASS correspondent was told this today by the Ministry of Ecology.

The radiation cloud is moving away in the direction of unpopulated territories. According to the latest figures, a radioactivity reading of 0.4 milliroentgens per hour was recorded 29 kilometers along the road between Tomsk and Samuski. Specialists from the Ministry of Ecology consider that it is still difficult to talk about the future spreading of the radiation, as the taiga conditions prevent more intensive work being carried out.

Aleksey Yablokov, the Russian president's adviser on ecology, considers that the pollution, which has spread over an area of 1,000 hectares "will remain forever". Speaking in a conversation with an ITAR-TASS correspondent, he did not rule out the possibility of similar accidents happening again in Russia, even in the immediate future.

Scale of Accident Debated

PM0704154593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 93 First Edition pp 1, 6

[Report by Andrey Illesh and Viktor Kostyukovskiy: "Nuclear Monster Has Spoken in Siberia, Danger Has Been Sensed All Over the World"]

[Text] By some strange accident, April in our country is a nuclear month. Let us recall that in 1986 there was Chernobyl, now there is Tomsk-7... Although these accidents cannot be equated from the technical viewpoint, for all of us these two events are brought close together by one factor—the nuclear risk factor. Today we are talking a lot about the economic catastrophe, but events are also bringing the ecological catastrophe to the fore. The collapse of industry carries the threat not only of a deterioration in people's lives but also of a "nuclear spring"—a danger to our lives in general.

As we have already reported, on 6 April an accident occurred at a plant of the Siberian chemical combine in Tomsk-7 accompanied by the dissemination of radioactive contamination. What happened essentially was that a tank containing a uranium production suspension blew up. A fire broke out on the roof of the building as a result... What is the situation now?

As of 2006 hours on 6 April six mobile civil defense troops detachments were operating in the region of the accident at the Siberian chemical combine and in Tomsk-7 itself, an INTERFAX correspondent reports. The State Commission for Emergency Situations press center reported that a preliminary study of the area had shown that the level of radioactive contamination at the site of the explosion is 30 milliroentgen an hour, while 19 km Northeast it is about 40 milliroentgen an hour. The projected area of radioactive contamination is about 1,000 hectares. The fighters from the Siberian chemical combine military fire unit who took part in extinguishing the fire are now undergoing examination.

For your information, the Siberian chemical combine in Tomsk-7 produces weapons-grade plutonium and processes used uranium and plutonium in nuclear reactors using so-called centrifugal technology.

We got in touch with Tomsk-7. Chemical combine director Gennadiy Khandorin is talking:

"It happened at our combine's radiochemical plant which processes used fuel elements from nuclear reactors. This time it was not nuclear fuel but another material of a similar nature which was being processed. For reasons as yet unestablished high pressure developed in the apparatus, which is a container with a capacity of 34 cubic meters. Within six minutes the pressure reached such a level that it destroyed the apparatus. I stress once again that it is not a case of a nuclear reactor, but of a technological apparatus in which a chemical reaction takes place. The destruction of the apparatus was accompanied by some release of radioactive aerosol gas contamination."

[IZVESTIYA] How great is it?

[Khandorin] The contamination zone is restricted to the plant's territory. In addition discharges of harmful substances into the ventilation shaft have increased somewhat. But a radiation survey determined only one place with a very small dose of local contamination on the highway between the oblast center and the settlement of Samus. There are no reasons for closing this road, we are monitoring the vehicles traveling on it and they remain "clean." Nonetheless work is underway to decontaminate that sector.

[IZVESTIYA] Does that mean that it is not a case of an explosion, but rather of the bursting of a manufacturing capacity?

[Khandorin] Yes, but that burst was accompanied by phenomena of an explosive nature. It was extinguished immediately.

[IZVESTIYA] There has been a lot of talk of casualties. Have there actually been any?

[Khandorin] No one received mechanical or radiation injuries. We carefully monitored all our workers who were in the vicinity. The largest dose, which was received by a man who extinguished the blast at this capacity, is 0.6 roentgen equivalents. That is about one tenth of the permitted annual dose, which presents no threat to health. The doses received by other workers vary from one hundredth to one tenth of a roentgen equivalent.

[IZVESTIYA] When was the population informed of the incident?

[Khandorin] The news came an hour after the accident over our city radio. A little later it was broadcast on oblast television. At 0700 hours on 7 April my deputy spoke on oblast radio. That is, we are giving exhaustive information so it is absolutely beyond our comprehension what sources are being used by Russian radio journalists who are citing absolutely unreal figures for the scale of the incident and the degree of contamination! What happened is exactly as follows: An extremely unpleasant incident which, fortunately, did not entail any serious consequences to people or to nature. The essence of the incident is now being ascertained, chemists are working on it. [Khandorin ends]

"The radiation situation in the oblast center—in Tomsk—and in Tomsk-7 where the accident happened at the Siberian chemical combine, is within natural background radiation limits," an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told over the telephone by Viktor Kress, head of the Tomsk Oblast administration. The head of executive power also said that a task force created by the administration is working to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the territory of the combine. The oblast leader asserted that the incident is described as "an emergency situation of local importance and cannot be compared in scale with the Chernobyl catastrophe."

Last night several mobile radiation monitoring devices continued to study the zone over which the dangerous spot might have spread. So far they have traced a narrow band up to 1 km wide and 8 km long to one side of the city. The fall-out on individual sectors of local highways was washed away at night by special equipment.

According to the preliminary estimate, Viktor Kress asserts, the building which suffered from the explosion will be fully restored in no more than six weeks.

A SIBERIAN PRESS correspondent was told by Vasiliy Romanov, chief of the Kemerovo Oblast civil defense directorate, that no increase in background radiation has been registered in Kemerovo Oblast. He said that civil defense specialists have set up radiation monitoring posts at the population centers of Mariinsk, Andzhero-Sudzhensk, Yan, and Tayga. On the morning of 7 April a helicopter flew specialists from Tomsk Oblast to the border to monitor the background radiation. According to information from the civil defense headquarters the radioactive cloud is now moving Northeast away from Tomsk-7. According to Vasiliy Romanov the civil defense regiment has been put on combat alert and is in a "forward position." A task force from the Russian State Committee for Emergency Situations flew out 7 April to the place of the incident to investigate the reasons for the accident and determine the possible consequences.

The Tomsk Civil Defense headquarters has denied 6 April INTERFAX and TASS reports that the explosion created a large seat of radiation danger and that there is a radiation leak...

...Finally, a brief resume of the reports from the scene of the tragedy. Yes, tragedy, because an accident at any nuclear production facility, especially involving the discharge of radioactivity into the atmosphere, is a tragic event. The history of Chernobyl, the catastrophes of the fifties in Chelyabinsk-65 at the "Mayak" combine, and other terrible stories painstakingly kept quiet under pressure from the military-industrial complex teach us that. And it is criminal to play down what has happened.

But it is extremely important to note something else now: The explosion (for perhaps the first time in the chain of such events from 1949 until recently) was made public almost immediately. Let us recall the silence of the first days of the very large nuclear accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, let us recall that IZVESTIYA—the first among the Soviet press—managed to write of the Urals explosions only 30 years after the incident! So times are changing. Let us hope that despite today's rather cheerful and rassuring tone, the specialists at the Ministry of Atomic Energy will investigate the incident thoroughly. And, most important, will notify the public of all the facts without their usual "correcting." Let us hope: After all, it is very problematical for journalists to enter the closed city of Tomsk-7. News agency reports are contradictory. So far we can only trust that the nuclear scientists are right...

The events in Tomsk-7 warn us that the nuclear monster of the former USSR is seriously ill. The problems caused by the universal political and economic disorder are striking a painful blow to the military-industrial complex. Wages in once "prestige" closed cities, the lack of demand for the output, and the painful progress of conversion, unless very serious attention is paid to them, could bring real upheavals. Alas, that is not a forecast designed to intimidate each other. It is a fact.

Yeltsin Protests Abolishment of Mordovian Presidency

LD0704082193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0607 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—On 6 April President Boris Yeltsin sent a telegram to the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Mordovia, his press service has revealed. The telegram says, in part: "It is with profound alarm that I received the news of the decision by the Supreme Soviet of Mordovia to abolish the institution of the presidency in the republic. This is above all because such a decision directly infringes the fundamental principles of the Russian Federation Constitution. The president of Mordovia was elected by the people of the republic.

"The decision to abolish the institution of the presidency, therefore, and all the more so when taken in haste, threatens to destabilize the situation. This is simply impermissible now, when the whole of Russia is preparing for a nationwide referendum on 25 April. The referendum will provide an opportunity for all people of Russia, including the citizens of Mordovia, to demonstrate its will regarding the way the state is to develop further. I voice my conviction that you will be able to find a sensible legal solution, and that the progress of democratic transformations in the republic will be continued."

Chechnya 'Disregarding' Referendum; To Hold Own Poll

LD0704112993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1000 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sharip Asuyev]

[Text] Groznyy, 7 Apr—Chechnya is openly disregarding the 25 April referendum announced in Russia, but will evidently soon be holding its own nationwide poll on what form of rule in the republic its citizens prefer. The Chechnya parliament was planning to hold such a referendum on 27 March but postponed it until the relevant law was adopted. Now the Chechnya Republic Law on the Referendum has been adopted, and it enables organizers to put any problems at all to a nationwide referendum, including questions on the status and territorial integrity of the republic.

The precise date and wording of the questions for the upcoming referendum are not yet known. The question which is increasingly frequently raised in the republic is: Does Chechnya really need the post of president? It is not ruled out that this very question will be the main one that parliament puts to a nationwide vote.

Troops Reportedly Pulling Out of Ingushetia

LD0604174593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1545 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Here is an urgent report from Pavel Guskov, our correspondent in Stavropol Kray. Go ahead.

[Guskov] Good evening. My report is not even about Stavropol Kray. I have just learned that the withdrawal of troops has started, the troops stationed in Ingushetia that used to ensure security in the zone of state of emergency. A few minutes ago I spoke about this with Ingush President Ruslan Sultanovich Aushev. He said that this is being done at the republic's request and will undoubtedly yield a positive result.

It is interesting to note that I have just received a Chechen press report from Groznyy reporting the same fact. The agency stressed that the troops were leaving posts that, according to the agency, are situated about 20 km inside the Chechen republic. The agency claims that the posts are being taken over by staffers of the state motor vehicle inspectorate [GAI] of the Ingush republic. The report expressed concern about whether this fact could aggravate relations between Chechnya and Ingushetia. Touching upon this problem in reply to my question, Ingush President Ruslan Aushev stressed that the GAI posts are simply controlling traffic; there is no intention to seize any disputed territory here, and the issue of the borders between the Chechen and Ingush republics will be examined later. In any case, there is hope that things have started moving toward a better result, toward calm in this much-suffering area.

Troops 'Almost Fully Withdrawn'

OW0604185093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1711 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Russian troops have been almost fully withdrawn from the territory of Ingushetia. Ruslan Piliyev, head of the Ingush presidential administration, reported this to Interfax, saying that Russian troops had been replaced in their posts by employees of the republic's traffic police.

An Interfax correspondent reports from Ingushetia that today Russian military personnel are still guarding the airport and the village of Sunzhenskaya, as well as two other posts: the exit from Nazran and the region of the village of Kantyshevo, which borders on North Ossetia.

President Appoints Russian General Vice President

LD0704113993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1039 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Sharip Asuyev]

[Text] Nazran April 7 TASS—47-year-old ethnic Russian Lieutenant-General Boris Agapov has been appointed vice-president of the Ingush Republic by decree of Ruslan Aushev, Ingushetia's first-ever president.

The vice-president is now staying in Moscow. He is known to have been a commander of the former Soviet Union's border troops and was personally acquainted with Ruslan Aushev. His experience of a border guard will hardly be helpful to Boris Agapov, at least in the republic's relatonship with Chechnya. The Russian troops deployed on the line between the Chechen and Ingush Republics have already been withdrawn from that zone. Only Ingush traffic police officers still remain on their point-duties. Ingush authorities are firmly convinced that the borders between the two republics can and should be "transparent".

At present, the situation in the greater part of Ingushetia is gradually returning to normal following the lifting of state of emergency rule. The Ingush president's first aide, Kazbek Keligov, told TASS that the April 25 referendum "will be held in the republic, although without special enthusiasm". According to him, Ingushis are practically unanimous in accusing the Russian leaders of backing Ossets in the recent conflict and therefore may vote against both the Russian president and parliament.

Aushev Accuses Ossetia of Delaying Refugee Return

OW0504134193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1226 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President of Ingushetia Ruslan Aushev evaluated as an intentional delay the fact that the Ossetian side has still not selected delegates for the joint commission of representatives.

The joint Ossetian-Ingush commission, intended to resolve problems of returning Ingush refugees to the Prigorodnyy Region of North Ossetia, should be established in accordance with the agreements made in Kislovodsk. The commission, which is to include 15 representatives from each side, will be led by Major-General Vyacheslav Ulybin, the deputy head of the temporary administration.

In an interview with Interfax on Monday [5 April] Aushev said that if Ossetia continues prolonging the process, the Ingush leadership "will be forced to find other approaches to solving the problem."

Troop Exercises Continue in North Caucasian Region

LD0604201693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1850 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Gondusov]

[Text] Rostov-on-Don April 6 TASS—The command and staff exercises of the North Caucasian group of the Russian Interior Ministry's troops are in their second day now.

"The peculiarity of the exercises lies in the fact that they are held against the background of the real situation in the region," Major General Vitaliy Bosov, chief of the exercises directing staff, told ITAR-TASS on Tuesday.

"The situation in Northern Ossetia and Ingushetia remains tense. Dope and arms are flowing into Russia from Transcaucasia. Explosions, arsons, acts of terrorist, armed assaults—that is what we are having in the region nowadays. Our task is to pose in cooperation with the local law-enforcement bodies an effective shield against all sorts of crime," he said.

According to Bosov, the command and staff exercises of the newly formed group of the Russian Interior Ministry's troops aim to teach the commanders and staffs to analyse the situation, react promptly on its changes and manage the troops effectively.

Referendum Preparations in Moscow; Tambov Supports Yeltsin

LD0504160193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Preparations for the April referendum are gathering pace. The Moscow authorities announced today that they are to allocate slightly over 600 million rubles for holding the vote on 25 April.

Meanwhile, at a gathering of local democratic organizations and parties in Tambov, sharp criticism was levelled at the Tambov deputies in parliament. It was stated that today most of them do not reflect the views of their voters. It was also stated that the present constitution is out of date and binds reformers in the government hand and foot. As in various other regions, it has been decided in Tambov to set up a public committee to support the referendum and President Yeltsin.

St. Petersburg Residents To Be Polled on City's Status

PM0604134193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[RIA report: "St. Petersburg Claims Federation Subject Status"]

[Text] "Do you think that St. Petersburg should, by dint of its status, be a Federation subject equal to the republics within Russia?"—this additional question will be put to the city's residents in the 25 April 1993 referendum.

This decision was made by the City Soviet. As City Soviet Chairman Aleksandr Belyayev put it, the results of the local referendum will have no legal implications and can be viewed merely as a legislative initiative. If it is implemented, the city will have an opportunity to effectively solve its own economic and social problems, Belyayev believes.

Procurator Challenges Legality

LD0604202493 St. Petersburg Radio St. Petersburg in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The session of the city soviet has decided to submit one more question at the April referendum. It is formulated as follows: Don't you believe that St. Petersburg, according to its status, should be a subject of the federation, enjoying the same rights as the republics within Russia?

The city's procuracy has discovered in the deputies' decision contradictions to the legislation in force. In accordance with the RSFSR law on the referendum, the objection of St. Petersburg's procurator Vladimir Yeremenko points out that the decision to hold a referendum is taken by the Congress of People's Deputies or the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation.

Moreover, it is forbidden to submit to a referendum questions of changing the status and territorial integrity of subjects of the federation. By the way, the decision of the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies of 29 March of this year does not permit questions to be submitted at the April referendum that have not been approved by the congress. Having pointed out to the deputies that the session has exceeded the powers granted to it, the city's procurator required them to abolish the illegal decision without delay.

Yeltsin Receives Highest Rating in Tatarstan Poll

LD0604074893 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0700 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The results have been drawn from the first stage of a sociological survey on the popularity of Russia's top leaders held in Kazan. According to RIA, Russian President Boris Yeltsin has the highest rating, coming first in the poll a long way ahead of Rutskoy in second place. Sobchak was the third most popular. As for Khasbulatov and Baburin, whose names also figured on the request of the democratic forces of Tatarstan's joint headquarters questionnaire, they have so far not received even one percent of votes. The survey is continuing. It is being carried out at the request of the Democratic Forces of Tatarstan's joint headquarters for the referendum on 25 April.

Referendum Headquarters Set Up in Tatarstan

OW0604130193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1226 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Joint headquarters for the national referendum, representing all of Tatarstan's democratic and federalist organizations, has been set up in that republic. These organizations have worked out a joint position and will campaign for the dissolution of the congress and early parliamentary elections, and support President Yeltsin, the Russian Government and the reforms. The headquarters will be financed by the "Democratic Initiative" Public Fund.

The headquarters' chairman, People's Deputy of Tatarstan Ivan Grachev, believes that in Tatarstan the referendum will involve less than 50% of the citizens who have the right to vote. Most of them will cast their votes in support of Yeltsin, because the arrival of the "red and brown" opposition will be a catastrophe for the reforms and for Tatarstan's sovereignty, he said.

Vladimir Belyayev, the chairman of Tatarstan's branch of the Free Russia Popular Party, noted that the refusal of the majority of Tatarstan's voters to take part in the referendum can be explained by the position of the leaders and by the deliberate inactivity of the local administrations. The referendum is being opposed by the extremist wing of Tatarstan's National Movement, he said.

New Organization Set Up in North Caucasus

OW0504185693 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1622 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Russian Justice Ministry on Monday [5 April] registered a new organization, the Assembly of Democratic Forces of the North Caucasus.

According to the ministry, the organization encompasses as collective members eight associations and political parties in the North Caucasus, and has set itself the task of bringing together various public and political forces to achieve peace and conciliation in the region and develop friendship and equal cooperation there.

The assembly will also be seeking to provide conditions and make arrangements for the nonviolent settlement of any disputes between North Caucasian peoples.

The assembly's general secretary is Schmidt Dzabloyev. Its executive committee is located in Moscow.

Cossack Congress Ends; Volga Cossack Corps Reformed

LD0604111693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1107 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Boris Belyakov]

[Text] Samara April 6 TASS—The Volga Cossack Corps, dating back to 1571, has been restored here. The Cossack Congress, which ended in Samara today, has adopted its charter and endorsed the command structure of the Volga Cossack Corps. It will help the Russian armed forces train true defenders of the homeland.

International Affairs

Government Presents Stance on Nuclear Weapons

LD0604192093 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] In connection with the statement of the Russian Federation Government disseminated on 5 April regarding nuclear weapons located on Ukraine's territory, the press service of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine is authorized to state the following:

Unfortunately the Russian side has again resorted to distortions of Ukraine's position and made unfounded accusations against Ukraine. This requires additional explanation of Ukraine's approaches to this issue. Contrary to the assertions of the Russian government, the Ukrainian leadership has up to now not made statements which deviate from the intention declared by the Supreme Council of Ukraine to acquire non-nuclear status in the future. As is well known, this issue is currently under examination by the Ukrainian parliament, which is carrying out an all-round analysis of it.

Ukraine is opposed to having this entirely serious problem as the subject of political games. It is worth recalling that with the aim of removing speculation on the subject of the safety of nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory, the Ukrainian side proposed on 31 March to examine the possibility of inviting an authoritative international commission. As one of the successors to the former Soviet Union, and in accordance with the law of Ukraine of 10 September 1991 on enterprises, establishments, and organizations under Union jurisdiction located on Ukraine's territory, Ukraine confirms its right of ownership to nuclear components of weapons, and not to nuclear weapons located on its territory, including tactical weapons previously removed.

As is well known, in accordance with the Minsk agreement of 30 December 1991, nuclear weapons located on Ukraine's territory are operationally subordinate to the unified command of the CIS strategic forces, and so there are no grounds for changing this status. This position does not mean that Ukraine intends to acquire control over nuclear warheads. In owning only components of strategic nuclear weapons of the former Soviet Union, Ukraine does not have the possibility of unilaterally using these weapons, since elements of the control system are located beyond the boundaries of its territory. Neither does Ukraine intend to acquire such possibilities.

The realistic timetable for removing nuclear weapons from Ukraine's territory with the aim of dismantling and destroying them will be determined by a whole series of factors, not least of which will be the completion of the relevant Ukrainian-Russian talks and the conclusion of agreements which will make possible the elimination of nuclear weapons located in Ukraine.

Although the implementation of functions of operational control of strategic forces on Ukraine's territory is reserved for the unified command of the CIS strategic forces, the administrative control of them was handed over to the Ministry of Defense. Nothing in the concept of administrative control of the troops of strategic nuclear forces located in Ukraine gives grounds to see in it the intention to acquire direct control over nuclear weapons.

Out of considerations of principle, Ukraine cannot agree to foreign troops being located on its territory, to which the declaration of Russian Federation jurisdiction over nuclear weapons located in Ukraine will lead.

The disconnection of the main components of the missiles located on Ukraine's territory alone, without the parallel dismantling of the missiles themselves, would not ensure adherence to the demands of physical and ecological safety of missile complexes. All procedures of elimination of nuclear weapons are to be implemented in clearly defined sequence, proceeding from legal, technical, financial, organizational, and other possibilities. In this manner Ukraine has a serious and responsible attitude to the resolution of complicated problems connected with the existence of nuclear weapons on its territory, and is guided by agreements valid for it on relevant issues; it is not violating any of them.

Ukraine welcomes Russia's readiness to give it additional security guarantees. The main thing now is to ensure the necessary form, time, level and volume of giving these guarantees. We perceive with satisfaction Russia's readiness also to resolve the issue of compensation for nuclear materials, which are Ukraine's property. We understand that this readiness is also extended to components of tactical nuclear weapons which were previously removed. Ukraine gives especial significance to ensuring the safety of nuclear weapons, has always endeavored to create all the necessary conditions for this, and is ready to go on fully cooperating with the Russian side on the issues mentioned.

Ukraine calls on the Russian side to occupy a more constructive and realistic position in resolving these problems at bilateral talks. We are interested in all the complex issues of Ukrainian- Russian cooperation in the matter of destroying nuclear arms located in Ukraine being resolved without superfluous polemics and mutual accusations. The language of ultimata and pressure is not an acceptable form of contact between states, says the statement of the press service of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.

Reconfirms Right to 'Nuclear Components'

OW0604175293 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1708 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The statement of the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers distributed on Tuesday [6 April] says that Ukraine reconfirms its right to possess nuclear components, but not the nuclear weapons stationed on its territory. The document has been composed in response to the proposal of the Russian government dated April 5 to transfer the nuclear weapons stationed on the Ukrainian territory under jurisdiction of the Russian Federation and to withdraw all nuclear warheads.

The statement notes that the Russian party "distorts the republic's position and puts forward ungrounded accusations." To this effect the Ukrainian government has reconfirmed that the nuclear weapons stationed on Ukraine's territory remains in subordination of the CIS Joint Forces's command. The concept of an administrative control over the strategic nuclear forces deployed on Ukraine's territory does not give any grounds to view this concept as the republic's intention to gain direct control over the nuclear weapons," the statement continues.

The document also emphasizes that Ukraine, in possession of components of strategic nuclear arms of the former USSR, cannot unilaterally use them because the control and command systems are situated outside Ukraine's territory.

At the same time, "taking into account Ukraine's principal position, the republic cannot agree with staying of foreign forces on its territory," and according to the government, proclamation of the Russian jurisdiction over the nuclear weapons stationed on Ukraine's territory can lead to this.

The Cabinet has reconfirmed Ukraine's strive for a non-nuclear status and noted that the main question for the republic is to ensure "the form, time, level, and volume of security guarantees granted to the republic," and to solve the issue on compensation for nuclear materials, including components of tactical nuclear weapons withdrawn from the republic's territory in spring 1992.

The Ukrainian government has called on Russia to adhere a more realistic and constructive position at the bilateral negotiations, to refuse from ultimatums and pressure. The Cabinet of Ministers has reminded that "on March 31, 1993 the republic proposed to consider an issue concerning invitation of an authoritative international commission to Ukraine "to stop any speculations with respect to security of nuclear weapons deployed on the Ukrainian territory."

To Observe Minsk, Alma-Ata Accords

LD0604192593 Kiev UKRINFORM in Russian 1510 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] [no dateline as received] Ukraine supports general control over nuclear strategic forces, and Ukraine strictly observes the Minsk and Alma-Ata agreements on the control over CIS strategic forces. It has not violated a single agreement. This was stated by Colonel General Ivan Bizhan, deputy defense minister of Ukraine, commenting on the statement by the Russian Government with regard to the stationing of nuclear weapons on Ukraine's territory. This statement became the main issue at the news conference for Ukrainian and foreign correspondents that took place today at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' press center.

Russia has no grounds to accuse our state of violating the agreement, Gen. Bizhan stressed. Despite the agreements reached, it was specifically Russia that subordinated all strategic forces on its territory to itself. Then a decision was made by the Ukrainian Government on the administrative subordination of strategic weapons. As Boris Tarasyuk, Ukraine's deputy foreign affairs minister stressed, however, administrative subordination does not presuppose that our government assumes management over strategic nuclear forces. This is impossible, even from the technical side. The president of Ukraine still does not have the technical means to block the use of nuclear weapons.

In its statement, the Russian Government insists that Ukraine should recognize Russia's jurisdiction over its strategic forces. This means foreign troops being stationed on the territory of a sovereign state, which Ukraine could never agree to. The attempt to place strategic forces—which as a whole are serviced by Ukrainian citizens—under Russian jurisdiction is more than paradoxical.

We are not surprised at the timing that the Russian Government chose for its statement, Tarasyuk said. A summit was being held at the same time between the United States and Russia. This step should have persuaded Russia's opponents of the common position held by the United States and Russia with regard to the control over strategic weapons on the territory of the CIS. During the meeting between U.S. President Bill Clinton and Ukrainian Foreign Affairs Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, however, the U.S. President stressed that he relates to Ukraine's position on a number of aspects of control over nuclear weapons with understanding.

Ministries Respond to Grachev's Call To 'Pressure' Ukraine

AU0704102493 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 2 Apr 93 p 10

["Statement by Ukraine's Ministries of Defense and Foreign Affairs" issued in Kiev on 31 March]

[Text] Regarding reports carried by information agencies to the effect that on 31 March Russian Federation Minister of Defense Grachev called upon the world community to exert pressure upon Ukraine, Ukraine's Defense and Foreign Affairs Ministries are authorized to make the following statement:

The attempts to frighten the world community with a possible recurrence of the Chernobyl tragedy in Ukraine sound like mockery, considering that they come from that same country from which that tragedy came to our land. It appears that Russia's own economic and political pressure upon Ukraine are no longer sufficient, and its officials are now appealing to the world community for assistance. The questions of nuclear weapons in Ukraine are now being discussed by the Ukrainian parliament that will adopt decisions in the best interests of the Ukrainian people and Ukrainian state.

The artificially created excitement around the nuclear weapons on the territory of Ukraine is aimed at achieving Russia's jurisdiction over these weapons, so that Ukraine may be deprived of its right to compensation for the components of the weapons.

Therefore, we are dealing with yet another attempt to blackmail and intimidate us.

Ukraine has repeatedly stated and states now that it is ready to discuss and resolve, at any level, problems of nuclear and ecological safety of strategic nuclear forces in Ukraine. Regarding the speculations on this theme, we are ready to consider the question on the possibility of inviting an authoritative international commission of experts.

We are sure that the world community will draw a correct conclusion from such a dangerous call, as it did in the case of Russia's attempt to play the role of a self-styled "guarantor" of peace on the territory of the former USSR. We also appeal to the world community with a request to promote the creation of preconditions for nuclear disarmament not only in Ukraine, but also worldwide.

Kiev, 31 March 1993

Kravchuk Meets U.S. Congressmen, Views Talks With Russia

LD0604155093 Kiev UKRINFORM in Ukrainian 1251 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By UKRINFORM correspondent Anatoliy Grigoryev]

[Excerpt] Kiev, 6 April—Ukrainian-Russian talks on the fate of strategic nuclear weapons located on the territory of Ukraine have reached an impasse. I have therefore proposed to Boris Yeltsin that the solution to this problem should be at the level of premiers of both countries, Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk stated during a meeting with members of the U.S. Congress today. The representative delegation of American congressmen was in Kiev on a visit.

Russia is presenting the problem as if Ukraine does not want its solution, continued Leonid Kravchuk. I suppose that some politicians in the West do not know the details either. Strategic nuclear forces which are located on the territory of Ukraine are subordinate to the CIS, that is, including also Ukraine. Russia is now raising the question of the subordination of these forces to itself. Thus, what is at issue is a change in the status of the strategic nuclear forces on the territory of Ukraine. First, however, a legal document on the basis of which this could be accomplished does not exist. Second, a change in the status would mean that foreign troops would be situated in our land, Leonid Kravchuk stressed. In Ukraine there is no law which permits foreign troops to stay on its territory.

Everything which is on the territories of both Ukraine and Russia is the property of the state on which it is situated. This means that in order to transfer nuclear warheads or components to Russia—incidentally, they could be used at nuclear power plants—it is necessary to change the law. Therefore, in the opinion of the head of the Ukrainian state, all questions about the fate of nuclear weapons in Ukraine should be resolved not by means of pressure but proceeding from the realities which have arisen. Prime ministers of both states could unite the efforts of the sides to achieve a mutually acceptable goal, Leonid Kravchuk considers. [passage omitted]

Kuchma Urges U.S. To Remember Ukraine

OW0604160593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1501 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by diplomatic correspondents Andrey Borodin, D. Voskoboinikov, Igor Porshnev, and others; from the "Diplomatic Panorama" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Ukraine's Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma has urged the U.S. "to remember that Ukraine with a population of 52 million is on the map of the former USSR". Talking to newsmen after Monday's [5 April] meeting with U.S. congressmen, led by House democratic majority leader Richard Gephardt, he suggested that "Ukraine and other republics might have been forgotten at the Russo-American summit in Vancouver".

In Mr. Kuchma's words, he assured the congressmen that the problem of nuclear arms on the territory of Ukraine was non- existent. However, he declined comment on a statement by the Russian government, deploring Ukraine's position toward the nuclear weapons on its soil. He said he was expecting the full text of the statement through official channels.

Official Calls For Early Nuclear Arms Accord Ratification

OW0604210093 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1928 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Deputy Parliamentary Chairman Vladimir Grinyev says Ukrainian deputies must ratify all international agreements on nuclear-weapon cuts as early as possible. Speaking at a news conference in Kiev on Tuesday, Grinyev said he wanted Ukraine to become a nuclear-free state at the earliest time, adding that he would defend his position in the Supreme Soviet.

At the same time, he warned against Russia's attempts to try to juggle the issue and talk in an ultimatum-like tone with Ukraine, describing this as a hopeless policy. Grinyev said that nothing short of a sustained movement towards a nuclear-free status and realization that this was a common problem could lead to a success.

In Sevastopol, the Ukrainian official reaffirmed his commitment to the idea of transferring it for long-term lease to Russia, an option that he believes would make both sides happy. However, he said this would imply Russia's legal recognition of Ukrainian sovereignty over the Crimean territory and help resolve the issue of the Black Sea Fleet.

On the prospects of relations with Moscow, Grinyev said the economies of the two countries would remain interlinked for the next twenty years. He said Ukraine would remain Russia's main trading partner in the West for a long while yet. Grinyev believes that the huge economic potential that Ukraine inherited from the former Soviet Union can only be exploited together with other republics.

National Affairs

Kravchuk Explains Views on Events in Russia

AU0604162093 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 1 Apr 93 p 2

[Interview with President Leonid Kravchuk by a correspondent of the Ukrainian Television and Radio Broadcasting Company and by UKRINFORM correspondent Oleksiy Trotsenko in Kiev on 30 March: "Leonid Kravchuk on the Events in Moscow and on Ukraine's Position"]

[Text] **On 30 March, Ukraine's President Leonid Kravchuk made a speech at the first session of the National Committee for Combating AIDS. During a break, he agreed to answer reporters' questions regarding events currently at the focus of attention of the world public opinion, in particular, those associated with the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies of Russia.**

At the request of the Ukrainian Television and Radio Broadcasting Company [UTRBC] correspondent to give an assessment of these events, the president said this:

[Kravchuk] As regards an assessment of the congress, it is a Russian affair. I believe that Russians, as well as all others who followed and analyzed the congress drew their own conclusions and offered their assessments. For our part, we must do everything to prevent such a thing from happening in our country. We do have such symptoms. We felt this during sessions of the Supreme Council. In the provinces, there are problems of interrelations between presidential power structures and self-government. It would, therefore, be a mistake to say that there are no difficulties in implementing power functions at all levels. However, there is no confrontation.

Second. It is necessary to make a conclusion that it is not only possible to talk about improving power structures, but also to act accordingly. One should not manipulate power functions by brandishing the Constitution like a rolling-pin. First of all, this rolling-pin is far from being brand new. If somebody wants to find things that suit him in the Constitution, he will find them. This is because the Constitution that we have today is such as has been supplemented and altered over the last two years. If we make an analysis, we will see at once that the laws contradict the Constitution and the articles are not consistent. It is, therefore, very difficult to use the Constitution as a means for resolving all of our today's problems.

It seems to me that our most important task in Ukraine is the adoption of a new constitution. Only after that will we be able to say: All of the power structures and the entire power—from the center to the lowest levels—are based upon the principles specified in the articles of the new constitution, and everybody must fulfill them. I think this is the most important thing. I support the idea that is being voiced: The draft constitution must be discussed at a meeting of the Constitutional Commission, and common positions must be found, especially on fundamental issues: How should we build the power at the center, in the provinces, at the level of oblasts, cities, rayons, or villages. When the Constitutional Council adopts its decisions, the relevant documents may be submitted to the Supreme Council. The constitution must not be adapted to old structures. It must be a new constitution of a new Ukraine.

[UTRBC] What you have said about the division of powers implies executive, legislative, and judicial powers. The example of Moscow has shown that the fourth power—the press—also very much depends upon the decision that may be adopted by the congress or by the Supreme Council. The striving to use glasnost, the freedom of speech, and democracy to one's own advantage is one of the negative consequences of the processes that took place in Moscow.

[Kravchuk] The main thing is that we must fulfill those laws on the press and on information that we have adopted. We have them.

[UTRBC] Don't you think that coexistence with Russia will now be more difficult?

[Kravchuk] It is possible that it will be more difficult. However, the end of the congress is not yet the end of everything. After decisions are adopted, they must be fulfilled. To my mind, the holding of a referendum is problematic. It is like this. It was decided to hold a referendum. I will say this about the fact that the congress decided to disband executive structures in the provinces, structures that are subordinated to the president: This will be difficult to do, because thousands of people are behind them.

To take Ukraine, I insist and will continue to insist that everything must be done after a new constitution is adopted. Today, this would mean a step toward confrontation. The main thing is to avoid it and to unite parties, forces, movements, the deputies corps, and presidential structures to emerge from the economic crisis. Because, in the final analysis, the situation will be determined by the economy. I can say that it is extremely difficult today, and I agree that, objectively, the economy may further deteriorate as a result of the processes that are under way in Russia. Because, if there is an exacerbation there, even on the oblast or rayon scale, it will affect production. If this is going to be the case in Russian production, it will also influence their ties with us.

That is why we must think about what we can do in extreme situations. When the budget was being adopted, I said that we needed to have an anticrisis committee. I am confirming this once again.

Without this, we will hardly be able to work effectively. The committee must have powers and control functions, and it must coordinate everything that is done every day, every 24 hours, and it must work round-the-clock. It must check how structures work in the provinces, and how ministries function, and what relations exist with banks, in particular with the National Bank, and who is doing what in this situation. Because the main thing is to survive economically. Our government is functioning in an extreme situation and is looking for ways out. It needs assistance. We must unite and put an end to confrontation, to incitement by some people against others, to attacks by some people against others, to accusations, and to allegations that have been unsettling and destabilizing our society all the time.

[URTBC] Spring is traditionally associated with a rise in temperature and with an exacerbation of political struggle. This will also further complicate the process of stabilization.

[Kravchuk] If people would heed common sense and hear my call, I would, for example, request today that all political parties and political forces—left- and right-wing and centrist ones—get together and appeal to the Supreme Council or to the president with a proposal to introduce a moratorium on all rallies and on all artificially incited strikes, and so on to emerge from the crisis. If at least some people would show an example: We are calling for union and not for strife. We may have dissimilar views and dissimilar ideological convictions, but the main thing is to survive economically. We must unite for this period of time. When an economy is sick, any stress is dangerous for it.

[Trotsenko] Recently, well-known American political scientist Zbigniew Brzezinski made a speech at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. He spoke about relations between Russia and Ukraine and about the position occupied by the United States.

One of the conclusions drawn by the political scientist is as follows: There is an increasing number of facts pointing to the fact that certain pressure is being exerted upon Ukraine for the purpose of isolating it and undermining its socioeconomic structures. To confirm this, he quoted facts from the situation that has taken shape in our country with regard to supplying energy sources from Russia. How will you comment upon this and how do you see future interrelations between Ukraine and Russia?

[Kravchuk] Mr. Brzezinski is an experienced person. He is a person who analyzes the world proceeding from corresponding experience. We must hear what he says. Of course, he is a bit too far away from us. I can say this: There are nuances that are only known to us—Ukraine and Russia. I think that we cannot talk about open pressure. However, there are economic ties between Ukraine and Russia, and they are very close ties. There exist problems of strategic nuclear weapons and of the Black Sea Fleet. All the time, we have wanted to render economic relations independent of political ones which we may, in the final analysis, be able to resolve. Because these problems, even though they are extremely important, are, after all, regional. As regards the economy and those same gas and oil, interests of all the people living in Ukraine are affected. Incidentally, also including Russians. If Russia is concerned about the fate of Russians residing in other states, it must also take this situation into account.

However, this is not a global problem. What is global is the fact that economic relations must be based upon principles of economic expediency and so on. I am in favor of this. I am convinced that we will manage to establish precisely such relations with Russia.

[UTRBC] Do you think that the events we witnessed in Moscow during the congress will have a negative effect upon the very process of preparing for the ratification by our parliament of START I and of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty?

[Kravchuk] There will be some influence, but I do not think it will be significant. Our course is specified in the Declaration of Ukraine's Independence and in the Supreme Council decree. Besides, the majority of our people's deputies, realizing the complex nature of the problem, will insist that the course that has been chosen must be consistent and unalterable. It is a different matter that something will also be discussed by the Supreme Council. These are guarantees for our state's security, financial and organizational problems, and some reservations. It is a normal process. However, it is not possible to formulate the question in such a way as though we are changing our strategic and political course as a result of the difficult political situation in Russia.

[UTRBC] Leonid Makarovych, the trip to the United States by Ukraine's minister of foreign affairs Anatoliy Zlenko and his meetings with President Clinton and other representatives of the new administration provide grounds for hopes that the new administration intends to develop relations with Ukraine more efficiently.

[Kravchuk] It cannot be like this: Ukraine has been created today and, tomorrow, the whole world will only pay attention to it. Mankind must see who we are, what policy we will pursue, what course we adhere to, whether our steps are consistent or are due to a certain situation, so that very serious correctives may follow. A state has emerged and it must be studied. It takes time. This is first.

Second, a state always declares about itself through its possibilities—economic, financial, or informational. We do not have them. This creates an information vacuum for other states—that is to say, there is not enough knowledge about our country as a state. This must also be seen. However, time goes on. I have already visited the United States twice, parliamentary delegations also visit there, meetings are held at the level of commissions, parliamentarians, the Supreme Council chairman, and the prime minister. These trips abroad are very important. They provide knowledge and information about our people, our state, and our policy. No state can exist in isolation. We are overcoming this vacuum by our direct contacts. It is very important.

Yesterday, I received information from the minister of foreign affairs about his trip to the United States. I am satisfied with his work—both informational and political. I hope that this is yet another step toward recognition. We must do this.

However, there is a danger here. Many delegations go abroad, including delegations of [Supreme Council] deputies. Every deputy has his own point of view, which I respect, of particular problems. While abroad, he expresses it. Nobody can prevent him. However, before expounding his point of view, he must say: This is not state policy, but my own point of view. Just imagine: A deputy makes a speech and declares that Ukraine must be a nuclear state. In the world, this is perceived in such a way: A deputy is saying this, so maybe it is the state's position. American congressmen behave in a different way. Some of them may come and say during a conversation: This is our state policy. I agree with this. However, in this question, for example, I criticize the government, but this is my personal point of view.

At the same time, in the practice of our parliamentarians, their personal positions are presented as the policy of the entire Supreme Council or of the state. This is, perhaps, a childhood ailment. It must be overcome, but it exists and does us harm. Sometimes I am compelled to issue refutations and explain that this a certain deputy's personal idea, that the state policy is formulated by the whole parliament and not by an individual deputy, and that the state policy is the policy pursued by the government, president, and state structures. However, what can be done—this is a problem of establishing the state and the problem of our being too young.

Leonid Kravchuk also answered other questions asked by reporters.

Kravchuk Confirms Need for Tanker Fleet

LD0604083493 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] On 5 April Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk made a working visit to Odessa. In the course of his meetings with leaders of enterprises and with local authorities, the president confirmed the necessity for building an oil terminal in the Odessa area and for creating a tanker fleet of Ukraine.

Government Reviews Draft Budget

LD0604200693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1440 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Excerpts] We are now going over to Ukraine. Kiev is on the line, and here is our correspondent Vladimir Sokolov. Good evening.

[Sokolov] Good evening. This evening the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet was presented—after the now usual long delay—with a draft of the socio-economic development and the republican budget for 1993. The draft is in many ways very approximate because it is based on rather uncertain forecasts on how prices will rise on goods, and especially on fuels. However, its aims are rather grand. It proposes to considerably reduce by the end of the year the decline in productivity in some industries, such as coal mining and agriculture, and even to ensure some increase in productivity. The draft also proposes to slow down the average monthly price increase on industrial goods from last year's 12 percent to 4-4.5 percent at present, and to 4-5 percent on the consumer market. However, the plan does mention that if prices on fuel go beyond the anticipated increase, other prices will have to be increased by 2-3 percent more than predicted. The total inflation is to be reduced in the second half of the year to five, maximum 10 percent.

Power engineering remains the most vulnerable industry and its demand for fuel will not be fully satisfied. Therefore, some drastic measures have been proposed to save energy, such as the introduction of economical technologies and even a strict state distribution of energy resources. For the first time, it seems, the question was raised about lifting the moratorium on the building of new power generating units at nuclear stations.

The draft for the state budget is rather sad. With a state income of more than seven trillion karbovantsy, its proposed spending is more than 9.7 trillion, meaning a considerable deficit. The deficit is created by the ever increasing social needs of the population and the considerable losses in the income caused by tax reductions. In fact, taxes on profit, the VAT, and the income tax have all been reduced. At the same time, an explanation to the budget says that in order to equate the relationship between income and spending a new three percent tax is being introduced on the sale of all goods, including imported goods.

Nineteen percent of all spending will go to the social protection of the population. Socio-cultural needs will be given 27 percent. The budget proposes a number of measures aimed at cutting spending and introducing strict savings. For example, spending on the Armed Forces, border troops, and the National Guard will be considerably reduced. Spending on bodies of state management will also be reduced. Nevertheless, despite all the present difficulties, it is expected that by the end of this year coupons and karbovantsy will be replaced by grivna.

The debate will be sustained and harsh to judge by the hail of questions addressed to Viktor Pynzenyk, deputy prime minister and economy minister, who delivered the draft on socio-economic development, and to Hrihoriy Pytachenko, finance minister, who delivered the draft budget. [passage omitted]

After that, Ukraine President Leonid Kravchuk addressed the Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted] He is still speaking. At first he agreed that the project could not satisfy everyone because it does not even cover Ukraine's basic needs. However, he said that there were positive indicators in the budget. It is more realistic than the previous ones and is aimed at finding a way out of the economic crisis, although it does not cover the entire reform plan. [passage omitted]

Further on Deficit

OW0704015193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1928 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In 1993 the estimated budget deficit will amount to 7.5 percent of Ukraine's GNP, Grigory Pyatachenko, Finance Minister, told parliament.

The budget draft that the cabinet approved March 18 provided for a GNP of 13.6 Tn [trillion] karbovantsi with revenue amounting to 7 Tn and spending, to 9.1 Tn; the revised draft specifies the GNP as 15.8 Tn, the revenue as 8.1 Tn, and the spending as 9.2 Tn.

In the final draft over 50 percent of the spending are appropriated for social needs, chiefly social protection, education, culture, and health services.

Pyatachenko expressed confidence that Ukraine will have the 43 Mn [million] tons of oil it needs in 1993, chiefly through commercial transactions.

Preparations Under Way To Stop Chernobyl Power Station

LD0604095193 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0500 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] To fulfill the decision to stop the Chernobyl nuclear power station in 1993, a temporary boiler house is being prepared for commissioning. It will provide the minimum heat and steam necessary for the fulfillment of nuclear and radiation safety requirements. This was reported by Mykola Sorokin, director general of the Chernobyl nuclear power station production association. He stressed that on 31 March the State Atomic Inspectorate issued permission to unload fuel from the reactor of the second power unit. The station's personnel has started this work.

Deputy Premier Says Closing of Chernobyl 'Inexpedient'

LD0504173593 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1530 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Ukrainian Deputy Prime Minister Yuliy Ioffe doubts the correctness of the earlier decision to close the Chernobyl nuclear power station, where there was a disaster in April 1986. He made an inspection trip to the station and said that in conditions of an energy shortage it is inexpedient to close the station. Local newspapers say that this view was influenced by the arguments of the station's specialists. They say that a lot of money has been spent for higher reliability and safety of the station and now it is not inferior to other nuclear power stations of this type.

18 'Incidents' Occur at Nuclear Power Stations in Mar

AU0604155293 Kiev HOLOS UKRAYINY in Ukrainian 2 Apr 93 p 5

[Official statement by the Public Relations Service at Ukraine's State Committee for Atomic Supervision: "Safety at Atomic Electric Power Plants: The March Panorama" issued in Kiev; date not given]

[Text] During March, 18 incidents were recorded at Ukraine's nuclear power stations [AES]. They were individual failures of equipment and the technological and electrical systems. Seven of them took place at the Zaporizhzhya AES, four at the Chernobyl AES, three at the South Ukrainian AES, two at the Rivne AES, and two at the Khmelnytskyy AES.

Since these incidents only led to a reduction in electricity production and did not cause any violations of the restrictions or conditions for their safe exploitation, they were estimated as level zero incidents on the international scale.

The development of international ties is also contributing to the reliability of nuclear power engineering. A group of foreign experts worked for two weeks at the Khmelnytskyy AES as part of a specialized mission of ASSET [expansion not known] under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Proceeding from a comprehensive analysis of the entire exploitation practice since the day the station went on-line, they prepared and submitted for use specific recommendations for eliminating the basic causes of the most significant incidents and thus preventing future occurrences.

A meeting with a delegation of the Canadian Commission for Nuclear Energy Control was held at the State Atomic Supervision Commission. A memorandum was signed on the main trends for further cooperation and on providing corresponding assistance to the Ukrainian side.

The following were categorized as priority tasks: Cooperation on questions of regulating safety at fuel-cycle and nuclear fuel transportation facilities, the treatment of radioactive waste, the utilization of radioactive isotope sources, the accident-free utilization of the AES, the creation of a National Crisis Center, the normalization of the accounting for and control of nuclear materials and their physical protection, and so on.

In order to implement the coordinated program for interaction, the Canadian partners will finance the supply of computers, organizational equipment, communications systems, radio and spectrometry equipment, will organize advanced training for Ukrainian specialists, and will provide assistance in preparing expert analyses of licensing and inspection procedures and accurate documentation.

Belarus

Shushkevich Says Executive Branch 'Imperfect'

OW0704112193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1022 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Stanislav Shushkevich, Chairman of the Belarusian Supreme Soviet, described the existing structure of the executive branch in his country as imperfect. In an address to a national congress of young statesmen in Minsk Tuesday he agreed that introduction of the instutution of presidency would consolidate the executive branch. On the other hand, Shushkevich said: "The more I see what presidential structures can achieve in the CIS, the more the prospect of a parliamentary Belarus with a normal, strong and healthy parliament attracts me."

The parliament chairman said that he would work for closer economic cooperation with all CIS member states, first of all with Russia. He also confirmed his commitment to acquisition of non- nuclear status by Belarus. Shushkevich called on the deputies "to stick to their pledges" and not to change existing legislature outlining that Belarus's strategy was to become a non-nuclear country.

UK, Russia, U.S. Offer Security Assurances on NPT

WS0604135393 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belarusian 1000 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Great Britain, Russia, and the United States have sent texts of additional security guarantees, offered to Belarus in connection with its joining the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT], and ratification of the START I treaties.

Great Britain, being the treaty's depository, is joining the United States and Russia. In order to prove its intentions, it will take urgent measures at the Security Council to assist any non-nuclear signatory to the Nonproliferation Treaty, including Belarus, should it become a target of aggression, or if threats of nuclear aggression were to be made against it.

The United States has confirmed its commitment to refrain from threatening to use nuclear arms in order to violate territorial integrity or political independence of other states. It will not use any of its weapons, except in self-defense or in accordance with the UN Charter.

The Russian Federation has confirmed its support for the provision of the 14 February 1992 declaration by CIS leaders, stating that any possible disputes between CIS members will be solved through negotiations.

Shushkevich on Economic, Military Union, Presidency

WS0704083793 Minsk RID in Russian 1207 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Speaking at the First National Congress of Young Politicians, convened in Minsk on 5 April, Supreme Soviet Chairman Stanislav Shushkevich said: "Walesa, Suchocka, Brazauskas, Kravchuk, Gorbunovs, and Godmanis are very well-informed on the course of events in Belarus. This cannot be said about Germany, for instance. However, we live in different worlds, and Western Europeans are unable to understand things that are evident to us."

Answering a question from a Belarusian Communist Party representative about signing the CIS joint security treaty, the chairman said: "We support an economic union with Russia and other CIS members. With regard to political and military unions, we have no interest in the Sea of Okhotsk or Tajikistan. The Communists may be interested, but we are not." At the same time, Shushkevich pointed out: "The chairman is obliged to sign any document adopted by the Supreme Soviet. I have no right to refrain from signing it."

The chairman meant that if the lawmakers made a decision to walk out on neutrality and join a military union with Russia, he would have to obey. He also said: "My attitude toward a union of the Black Sea and Baltic states is as negative as it is toward any military political union. I have nothing against economic unification of these states, but I dislike the idea of creating a counterbalance to Russia."

While predicting the future of the CIS, Shushkevich said: "What will be, will be. We must work to make this future come true."

The chairman also spoke about the possibility of introducing the presidential post in Belarus: "According to the existing draft constitution, our president will have so much power, that in comparison, Yeltsin and Kravchuk have no power at all. The longer I look at presidency in the CIS, the more I want to go back to the parliamentary Belarus."

Kozlovskiy Addresses Supreme Soviet on Army

WS0604124493 Minsk VO SLAVU RODINY in Russian 27 Mar 93 p 1

[Text of report by Colonel-General Pavel Kozlovskiy, Belarusian defense minister, at the emergency session of the Belarusian Supreme Soviet: "Belarusian Legislature Has Adopted a Decision on the Army's Politicization"; last two paragraphs are editorial board's commentary on the report]

[Text] Esteemed People's Deputies!

The Supreme Soviet has adopted the main laws on the building of our Armed Forces. These laws were met with great fervor by the Army personnel. On 31 December

1992, the servicemen took the oath of allegiance to the Belarusian people. Those servicemen who did not want to serve in Belarus have already left the Republic. But we are aware of the Supreme Soviet's anxiety for the combat readiness and the reforms in the Army.

The adopted laws have not solved the issue of the Army's depoliticization. Some would like to see that honest and efficient officers are someone's "agents of influence." To some extent, the adopted legal norms are ambiguous and could introduce unnecessary and harmful political nuances into the building of the Army during the period of reforms.

The formulation of the laws speaks very dubiously about the prohibition of activities of political parties and political social organizations, and about fact that the servicemen can participate in different parties' activities only when out of service. (By the way, we had submitted for consideration more exact formulations of the Laws "On the Statute of the Servicemen," "On Defense," "On the Armed Forces of the Republic of Belarus.")

It seems that from the point of view of the Declaration of Human Rights such a correlation of politics and the Army's interests is reasonable. But in practice, the Army is more and more directly or indirectly involved into political processes and this is done parallel with the raise of political activity of the Republican parties and political movements.

Both the "left" and the "right" parties count on the Army. They try to use the Army as a detonator for reaching their political aims. Their appeal to the Army has the aim of both discrediting the government and holding sway over it.

Some politicians blacken the Belarusian Armed Forces and call them "the fifth column of Russia," claiming that they are unable to protect Belarusian national interests. These labels are absurd because our Army has just taken the oath of allegiance to the Belarusian people, to the Belarusian state, and is under the state's jurisdiction. The Army is engaged into the military training. I have just come from the commander and headquarters staff training. Our officers and privates are engaged in military training necessary for the protection of our state.

Along with this, the public impression (with the assistance of the mass media) is being given that the Army is corrupt and that Army officers are engaged in unlawful actions. They claim that Belarusian officers are persecuted, that only Russian officers are promoted, that the process of transfer of Belarusian servicemen from the heated regions of the former USSR is too slow, and so on and so forth.... NARODNAYA GAZETA, the organ of the Belarusian Supreme Soviet does not publish our point of view on these issues. So whom does this newspaper represent?

It is obvious that these statements are completely unfounded. Furthermore, these statements are completely political in their character and aim to divide public opinion on the Army; compromise the Army, and thus the ruling political organs; and to alienate the officers of different nationalities and political persuasions.

The Belarusian Association of Servicemen [BAS], a political organization having the status of a social and political association, heads this political campaign. It is represented by a not numerous group of officers in state military service and retired officers. They are not supported by the Army. What is more, the servicemen wonder why we do not transfer them to the reserve for their political activity.

It is paradoxical, but certain elements of the press make people believe that currently there are two Army structures in Belarus. The first military structure is represented by the Armed Forces formed by the state, while the second is symbolized by the BAS representing certain political forces in the Army. These officers must observe the Army statute and all the Army laws, but being members of political parties they discredit the state conception of the Army building in Belarus.

This situation in Belarus is unprecedented: There is a political opposition within the Army. This has no parallel in any Army of the world.

The BAS officers make political statements in which they assess the military readiness of the Army, the Defense Ministry commandership, call for the derussification of the Army despite the Law "On Citizenship." In the recent radio broadcasts, they address the soldiers and sergeants of the Belarusian nationality not to obey the officers who are not Belarusians. The BAS activities are instigating and illegal. They are aimed at undermining the state defense capacity and are politically harmful.

Some people's deputies are also taking part in their activities.

Esteemed people's deputies! In my opinion, all the political tricks around the Army are anomalous and distract the Army from its serious reforms. After all, we must think seriously about the fundamental problems of the military building because they demand the state approach.

The Armed Forces are currently undergoing a reduction in staff. Thousands of officers, including those without housing who are waiting to be discharged into reserve status need the state's moral and social support. The issues of supplying the Army with technology, ammunition, fuel and lubricants; training of staff; and the formation of a basis for developing military science are on the agenda in the Armed Forces.

Currently, the Defense Ministry has developed programs for transferring cantonments to the state; for halting the illegal transportation of military equipment out of Belarus; for stopping embezzlement; and for fighting crime in the Army. The personal responsibility of generals and officers, including personnel in the Defense Ministry, has been raised.

I admit that for the first time in our history we are creating our own Army. It is a difficult process, and does not concern only the government and the Defense Ministry, so the mass media and all in society should participate in the building of the Army.

For these reasons, the Defense Ministry asks the Supreme Soviet to make decisions on the depoliticization of the Army.

The Supreme Soviet Commission for National Security, Defense, and Crime has discussed our proposal and strongly supports it. In the final analysis, it is up to you do decide.

The report of the Belarusian defense minister was accepted by the deputies with understanding. The proposal of the defense minister to depoliticize the Armed Forces was accepted. Two hundred twenty six deputies voted for it; one deputy was against. A small number of deputies abstained.

So, the amendment to the Law of the Republic of Belarus "On the Statute of Servicemen" prohibits servicemen from participating in the activities of parties and political organizations. Servicemen can engage in political activities only within the framework of the Officers' Meetings and organizations uniting war veterans.

Official Describes American Oil Investments

WS0704090093 Minsk NARODNAYA GAZETA in Belarusian 16 Mar 93 pp 1,2

[Interview with Vyatcheslav Nikilaevich Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the Belarusian Supreme Council, by newspaper correspondent A. Kryzhanovski: "Belarus Searching for Sources of 'Black Gold' but Hoping for Russia."; place and date not given—first two paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] The Belarusian press has already written about the Belarusian delegation's visit to the United States to discuss investment in oil exploration in Belarus with the management of American oil companies. Vyatcheslav Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the Belarusian Supreme Council, and the leader of the delegation, comments on the outcome of the visit, and the issue of Belarusian oil supplies:

[Kryzhanovski] Vyacheslav Nikolaevich, the fact that this delegation was headed by a deputy chairman of the Supreme Council speaks for the importance of the visit and the government's concern about the republic's oil supplies.

[Kuznetsov] The oil issue has become a matter of political importance for all the former USSR republics. You can read about it in any newspaper. We take a sober view on the supply of petroleum products for the Belarusian economy. You are aware of the impact of oil shortages on the spring planting and the ordinary automobile.

Each year, we need 20 million tonnes of oil to ensure the proper functioning of our transport. Each year, we extract about 2 million tonnes of Belarusian oil. Thus, we buy approximately 18 million tonnes abroad; primarily from Russia, because our bilateral trade agreements guarantee stable prices and steady deliveries. However, we cannot be fully satisfied with Russian oil deliveries. Why? This year, we will receive 16 million tonnes of oil from Russia; 11.4 million tonnes will be delivered on the basis of bilateral clearing. We will have to pay much more for the remaining portion. Moreover, we must buy several million tonnes of additional oil to avert an energy crisis which usually leads to the crisis of the republic's entire economic system.

[Kryzhanovski] So, are these the reasons to look for new sources of "black gold?"

[Kuznetsov] They are not the only ones. Our 1992 oil quota from Russia was 20.5 million tonnes; we can anticipate its decrease in 1994. Why do we think so? Because we are witnessing the process of gradual decrease in Russian oil extraction. If three years ago Russia was extracting more than 550 million tonnes of oil, 1992 Russian oil extraction was 383 million tonnes. This year they plan to extract 340 million tonnes of oil. Moreover the price is going up. In September 1992, one tonne of oil cost 2860 rubles [R]; in January 1993, we paid R17,500; in February R25,000; and R30,000 in March. I imagine that the price will go up several times by the end of this year. Our state debt to Russia, resulting from oil price increases and the establishment of bilateral clearing, amounts to R112 billion, or $173 million. If we do not change the situation, this tendency will go on. This presents a deadlock for our economy.

[Kryzhanovski] What is the solution? Can we rely on the foreign investments in the extraction of Belarusian oil?

[Kuznetsov] First of all, it is necessary to create a truly single economic space. We want to avoid the status of a debtor while we have a positive trade and payment balance. This is of great importance to us.

As for the oil, the Pripyat region contains 53 oil deposits and 39 are exploited. Oil is being extracted with difficulty from one third of Belarusian oil wells. The exploration in the Pripyat region is being carried out in only one third of its territory.

We need to search for oil in the entire Pripyat territory. We require about $300 million for further oil exploration in this area. Our republic cannot make such investments on its own because our 1993 budget has a 17 percent deficit. We must therefore look for new investors, including foreign investment.

During last year's joint Soviet-American Economic Council, I delivered a report on the economic situation in Belarus. Some representatives of huge American oil-extracting companies proposed cooperation after the meeting. They were planning to invest $100 million into oil exploration in Belarus and asked for guidelines.

At the end of February, contracts were drafted by the top management of the Grineberg [name as transliterated] Production Corporation, and the Santa Fe Energy Resources. The contracts proposed to invest in our developed deposits. They guaranteed an increase of oil extraction and allowed for bilateral shares. According to the draft contacts, exploration for new oil deposits would begin only after the companies covered their costs and had made a profit. Naturally, we could not accept their proposal because we are primarily interested in oil exploration in the new regions. A lengthy process of talks and compromises has begun. As a result, we have come to an agreement agreeable to both parties.

[Kryzhanovski] Could you be more precise? Or is it a trade secret?

[Kuznetsov] The draft project is still being developed. In general, we have managed to convince the American partners to invest both into oil exploration, and into exploitation of the existing oil deposits. The investment into these two areas will in simultaneous.

[Kryzhanovski] So, what are the planned investments?

[Kuznetsov] They are virtually unlimited. We give them an area for oil exploration and some existing wells to increase the extraction of oil. It is up to the Americans to use the appropriate equipment. However, they are sure of success. I wish to add that these American companies have been specializing in exploiting low-yield wells for tens of years.

[Kryzhanovski] What is their confidence based on?

[Kuznetsov] They have analyzed the results of our seismological testing. The results are positive. However, only sample drilling will provide the final answers. The Americans claim that their business is to make profits.

[Kryzhanovski] Vyacheslav Nikolaevich, the deposits of Belarusian oil are not inexhaustible. You must agree that they will depleted in time.

[Kuznetsov] In the immediate future, the government must develop a program of providing th national economy with all kind of energy resources. The program will incorporate the increased oil drilling, purchases of oil and gas, and the search for other reserves, including energy conservation measures. We will create joint oil-exploration ventures with Russia. We have already V9" Belarus was given five wells for oil extraction. We will not refuse from beneficial cooperation with foreign investors.

[Kryzhanovski] Where are your main oil interests: In the East or in the West?

[Kuznetsov] Only in the East: First, we have been there for quite a long time, and we have invested a lot of money and efforts. Secondly, we have established ourselves as stable partners. Thirdly, the cost of Russian oil is 37 percent of the world prices.

However, we should drop the practice of begging for oil deliveries. We must learn to work as the American companies: Invest money into oil and gas extracting in order to receive our share of the extracted oil. This will serve to protect the Belarusian economy from possible political catastrophes.

Kazakhstan

Nazarbayev Decree on Establishing Languages Committee

LD0604181893 Alma-Ata KAZTAG in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Decree by President Nazarbayev on the Creation of the Committee on Languages under the Cabinet of Ministers of Kazakhstan]

[Text] [no dateline as received] Taking as a basis the need to implement a single state policy in the sphere of language, ensure favorable conditions for the development of the national languages, and satisfy the national and cultural needs of the population, I decree:

1. To set up a Committee on Languages under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

2. To charge the Committee on Languages under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Kazakhstan with the following tasks:

—To put into practice and supervise the implementation of the law of the Republic of Kazakhstan "On languages in the Republic of Kazakhstan";

—To coordinate the activities of the ministries, state committees and departments, enterprises and establishments, and to interact with the public organizations on ensuring the fulfillment of the republican law on languages and on implementing the state program on the development of the Kazakh language and other national languages up to the year 2000;

—To elaborate and realize an efficient state language policy, together with all-inclusive programs on expanding the spheres of the public application and promotion of the state language;

—To coordinate onomastics and terminology work in the republic, to maintain the activities of the onomastics and terminology commissions under the Cabinet of Ministries of the Republic of Kazakhstan, and of the Republican Coordination Committee on the Implementation of the State Program for the Development of the Kazakh Language and Other National Languages up to the year 2000;

—To prepare proposals on upgrading legislative acts on languages.

3. The Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Kazakhstan:

—Should make provision for the needed allocations for financing measures on implementing the state language policy and the relevant programs;

—Should settle the issues of the financial and material-technical back-up for the Committee on Languages under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Kazakhstan;

—Within a month, should endorse a regulation on the Committee for Languages under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

[Signed] N. Nazarbayev, President of the Republic of Kazakhstan

Alma-Ata, 5 April 1993

Nazarbayev To Lead World Fund To Rescue Aral Sea

LD0604123393 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The Kazakh president, Nursultan Nazarbayev, has become the leader of an international fund for the rescue of the Aral Sea in Central Asia, whose waters reduced to nearly one-half of their original width because of thoughtless economic activity. An annual 140 tons of sand and salt are carried away by winds at enormous distances. The participants, which include Russia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan, will contribute to the fund one percent of their GNPs every year.

Tajikistan

Search Continues for 'Captured' Russian Border Guards

OW0604183893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1709 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The search for 10 Russian border guards captured in Tajikistan has not yet paid off. None of the armed Tajik groups in the section of the Khorog border patrol have assumed responsibility for the action. Interfax learned from reliable sources that the story that the border guards were captured by Afghan formations is so far unconfirmed. Field Commander Abdul Kadyr, who commands the neighboring section of Afghanistan, told the detachment command that his people were not involved in the incident. The search for those captured continues.

10 border guards were seized by a group of armed fighters on April 5. They were transporting artillery and technical equipment of the Khorog border patrol in two motor vehicles. According to preliminary information, the cargo was not taken. The vehicles with the cargo were thrown into a gorge.

A group from the Russian border troops headquarters left for Tajikistan to investigate the incident.

Russian Commander Investigates Abduction

OW0704111993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1021 GMT 7 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] General Vasiliy Gritsan, commander of the Russian border guard force in Tajikistan, took charge of an investigating team which is looking into the circumstances surrounding the abduction of 10 Russian border guards from the unit patrolling the Khorog stretch of the Tajik-Afghani border.

Conflicting reports on what happened to them have been forthcoming. One source in the security service did not rule out the possibility that the men had been moved to Afghanistan.

Another source thinks it more probable that the servicemen are held prisoner in Vanch district east of Dushanbe which is controlled by opposition forces.

Spokesmen of the Russian border guard force and Tajikistan's Interior Ministry and National Security Committee have said that they will not make public unconfirmed information "because human lives are at stake."

Russians Continue To Leave Tajikistan

PM0704090993 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 6 Apr 93 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Russians Are Continuing To Leave..."]

[Text] Some 300,000 people from the ranks of the Russian-speaking population have left Tajikistan since February 1990 when anti-Russian slogans were first heard, Feliks Dovzhenok, adviser to the Russian Federation Embassy in Tajikistan, has announced. The peak of migration was in 1992, when the Republic of Tajikistan was left by 105,000 Russian speakers, including many highly qualified specialists.

The complexities in resolving problems of the Russian-speaking population in Tajikistan, in the adviser's opinion, are connected primarily with the unsettled nature of legal problems between the republics. The signing of a bilateral treaty has been deferred for the fifth time now because of complications in the two countries' political lives.

Turkmenistan

Commentary Stresses Importance of President's Trip to U.S.

LD0604161093 Ashgabat Radio Ashgabat Network in Russian 1600 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Station commentary]

[Text] Last week Saparmurad Atyevich Niyazov, president of Turkmenistan, visited the United States and Great Britain. During the period of the USSR empire, they [as heard] were always frightening us about the United States, for 70 years. They showed that this country was our prime enemy. We have no alternative but to admit that we really thought it was like that. Such was communist propaganda.

However, it was not like that. After Turkmenistan achieved its independence and after the visit of our President Saparmurad Turkmenbashy, Turkmenistan opened the doors to the United States for the first time. He realized that the working circles of that country too wished to organize economic and cultural relations. American investors too understood that Turkmenistan went there not to beg for money, but to establish new economic relations on the basis of equal rights. For this reason, it is not necessary to stress the importance of the president's U.S. trip.

Niyazov Criticizes Cabinet Officials, Deputy Ministers

OW0604163593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1551 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] According to his press service, President Saparmurad Niyazov at a cabinet meeting reprimanded ministers in charge of the key branches of the economy.

Thus, he told off the Agriculture and Food Ministry, for raising obstacles to the privatization of land. He also criticized Deputy Prime Minister Nazar Suyunov and other senior officials in charge of the fuel and energy complex for paying too little attention to the republic's oil and gas production. Nor was Niyazov satisfied with the performance of the Turkmen railways.

He said the republic's total revenue had reached 86 Bn [billion] rubles, 34 Bn more than it had expended. The population's incomes had increased tenfold and the prices, only eightfold. However, the market was understocked, and people had large sums of money unspent, he said. For this reason he urged the banks to raise interest rates for the population.

The president criticized the banks for lack of initiative and called on them to "act in an original way, but in line with the law." He said the check payment system was being introduced too slowly. He set a deadline for its complete introduction, July 1. If the system were not introduced by that date, those who were to blame for it would be "deprived of half of their salary," he said.

Commenting on the republic's foreign economic relations, Niyazov said barter trade did not completely meet the republic's interests. The system should be gradually abandoned, and Turkmenistan must sell its raw materials for money, he said.

IF Note: Niyazov brought up the matter at his meeting with the Swedish Ambassador to Russia, Orjan Berner, on Monday [5 April]. The president said Turkmenistan was having problems in transactions with many republics of the former Soviet Union.

Armenia

Presidiums Issue Appeal to People

NC0604194293 Yerevan Armenia's Radio First Program Network in Armenian 1830 GMT 6 Apr 93

["Appeal to the Armenian People" issued by the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers Presidiums in Yerevan on 6 April—read by announcer]

[Text] Compatriots, the Armenian Republic finds itself facing a difficult situation. The policy of terrorism being implemented against the Armenian people—a policy which escalates when the self- defense forces achieve success in the Karabakh war theater—is assuming new dimensions. An open war was declared yesterday against all the Republic's communications routes. Armenia is under a total blockade. The pipeline feeding gas to Armenia was blown up again in Georgia. The railway is not working. Turkey has banned any transportation of goods through its airspace and territory. Azerbaijani is adamantly insistent on dragging Armenia into a military conflict.

Thanks to great efforts, the economy recently had been revived; the people had returned to work, factories had started to produce, and the export of goods had noticeably increased.

The Armenian authorities assure you that even under these critical conditions, they will do everything possible to ensure the unimpeded functioning of vital economic facilities, the equal and just distribution of existing resources, and political and economic stability.

Dear compatriots, we are living through one of the most fateful moments in our history. It is our generation's historic mission to be united and resolute in strengthening the Armenian state, in withstanding all trials, and in continuing to support the just struggle of our brothers in Nagorno-Karabakh.

Karabakh Commander Says No Russians Fighting in Karabakh

NC0604182393 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] A NOYAN TAPAN [Noah's Ark] news agency correspondent has asked Serge Sargisyan, chairman of Nagorno-Karabakh Republic [NKR] Self-Defense Committee, to comment on Azerbaijani reports that the Armenian forces are shelling Fizuli and are preparing to occupy it.

Sargisyan said the NKR self-defense forces' shelling of Fizuli was necessary to retaliate against the fierce shelling of Gadrut and many other border villages in Karabakh from Fizulinskiy Rayon.

Commenting on Azerbaijani allegations that Russian Armed Forces are fighting on Karabakh's side, Sargisyan said that there are not even a few Russian soldiers, let alone the Russian Army, assisting Karabakh.

First Deputy Foreign Minister Comments on Karabakh

LD0604230693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 2202 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 7 Apr—Armenia is concerned about the course of events in the region and will strive in every possible way to show a constructive approach in order to halt the escalation of tension and to find a peaceful solution to the problem, Zhirayr Liparityan, Armenian first deputy foreign minister, presidential adviser, said at a news conference at the republic's Foreign Ministry. He stressed that Armenia has not taken any military actions outside the republic's borders.

In the opinion of the representative of the Armenian leadership, the latest events are "a result of Azerbaijan's aggressive policy which believes that the Karabakh problem can be solved by military means, and its repeated rejection of proposals by Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh to stop hostilities until a cease-fire agreement is attained." The presidential adviser also said Azerbaijan is forced to continue hostilities because of internal political factors and the political vulnerability of the republican leadership, which is trying to achieve military success at any price.

The Armenian leadership is holding frequent consultations with Russia which, "as a state having a special relationship with Armenia and having interests here," is concerned over the situation in the region, Zhirayr Liparityan noted. According to him, these consultations mainly concern information on the situation in Karabakh and Armenia's borders. Such consultations will be continued in future, the diplomat said.

Touching upon Azerbaijan's appeal to the UN Security Council to condemn Armenia as a state guilty of aggression, Zhirayr Liparityan said: "Through our diplomats and by other means we must and are doing everything possible, and are confident that the UN Security Council will not adopt such a resolution."

Spokesman Berates Baku for Damaging Bridges, Pipelines

OW0604202993 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1927 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Having suffered a defeat in the armed confrontation with the Karabakh forces, Azerbaijan must have thought that it would rather fight with bridges and pipelines than with people. This was the response by the press-secretary to the President of Armenia. Aram Abramian, concerning the fifth since January. of 22 explosions of the pipeline, transporting gas to Armenia.

The explosion occurred on the border of the Gardabanskiy and Marneulskiy districts of Georgia. the latter inhabited predominantly by the Azerbaijanis, in the early morning of April, 6. Previously, on March 23, a railway bridge on the route to Armenia was blown up in the Marneulskiy district. It is promised to be restored by April, 8.

Today's explosion, stressed the press-secretary, is another step that proves Azerbaijan is not ready to peacefully resolve the Karabakh dispute, and still tries to get Armenia involved in military activities.

A. Abramian declared that Armenia "took no part in the fighting in Nagorno-Karabakh in the past and does not participate in it at present."

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Says Kelbadzhar Fall 'Serious Blow at Democracy'

OW0604161893 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1548 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report prepared by Andrey Pershin, Andrey Petrovskiy, and Vladimir Shishlin; edited by Boris Grishchenko; from the "Presidential Bulletin" feature—item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Abulfaz Elchibey told foreign reporters on Monday [5 April] evening that the Armenian army's occupation of Kelbadzhar District (a district in the west of the republic outside Nagorno-Karabakh) had dealt a "serious blow at democracy" in Azerbaijan. "The aggression has prevented us from continuing to move along the path of freedom and has forced us to declare a state of emergency," he said. In general, however, he said, the republic's leadership would still be using democratic methods, the current tough measures being necessary to ensure peace in the republic and its security.

According to Elchibey, Azerbaijan today faces "three principal destructive forces: Armenian occupation troops, foreign mercenary terrorist groups, and Russian officers and soldiers taking part in the hostilities." It was Russians who had directed the Armenians during their occupation of Kelbadhzar District, he said. He did not think, however, that what those Russian servicemen were doing had anything to do with the position and intentions of the Russian government. In his opinion, they were taking orders from some other forces in Russia. "We would like to know what those forces are," he said.

Azerbaijan was still prepared to take steps to settle the conflict by nonviolent means, the president said. Sooner or later, he said, the conflict would be resolved by negotiation anyway. He believes the talks within the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe should be continued, but they could not be resumed, he said, before Armenia withdrew its "occupation troops" from Kelbadzhar District.

Elchibey described the general situation in Azerbaijan today as "extremely grave," saying that Armenia was seeking to expand its occupation zone. The Armenians were now pressing towards the town of Fizuli, subjecting it to incessant artillery and rocket fire. He said the Azerbaijani army had managed to recapture two heights from which the Armenians had been shelling Fizuli. IF Note: According to Elchibey's press secretary, Arif Aliyev, some 55,000 people out of a total population of 60,000 had been evacuated from Kelbadzhar District by Monday evening, some of them being carried by helicopters, others managing to leave on their own. Officers from the International Red Cross were taking part in the rescue operations, he said. The total number of refugees from the conflict zone had reached 270,000, Aliyev said.

Seeks Egyptian Leadership's Help

NC0704065993 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1700 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] President Elchibey tried to call President Mubarak, who is in Washington, on 5 April. In light of his absence, Elchibey informed the Egyptian foreign minister on Armenia's latest attack, stressing that Kelbadzhar has been occupied by Armenian military units and that nearly 60,000 people have [words indistinct]. The Egyptian foreign minister assured Elchibey that he will inform President Mubarak on the situation.

Turkish Leader Telegrams Elchibey on 'Armenian Aggression'

NC0604133393 Baku AZERTAC in English 0725 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 5, (AZERTAC)—The President of Turkey Turgut Ozal, flying over Azerbaijan, on his way to Uzbekistan, has sent a telegram to Abulfaz Elchibey. This telegram goes, that Turkey together with Azerbaijan will try to do its best on the way of stopping the Armenian aggression and liberation of occupied by the enemies, areas of Azerbaijan.

Appealing to the president of "friendly and fraternal state", Ozal wished Elchibey, and in his person, all Azeri people good health, hapiness and all the best. He confirmed the desire of Turkish people to strengthen all kinds of relations with Azerbaijan. He also added, that he is going to visit Azerbaijan in the middle of April.

Defense Ministry Reports Armenian Assault on Kubatly

OW0604124593 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1225 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On the morning of April 6 Armenian formations launched an attack on the Azerbaijani regional center of Kubatly, which is located, like the cities of Lachin and Kelbadzhar which were seized earlier, between Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia. The Azerbaijani Defense Ministry reported this to INTERFAX. The attack is being made from the north, from the Lachin Region. Armenians, according to information from Baku, have advanced several kilometers in the past few days. Armenian front line units are now approximately 30 km from the regional center.

Baku reports that Armenian forces are building up in the Goriss Region of Armenia, which is only 8 km from Kubatly. On Monday [5 April] evening Kubatly was shelled by artillery from the territory of the Goriss Region.

The Azerbaijani army has secured the regional center Fizuli from the threat of seizure, confirms the ministry. However, fighting is still going on 4-4.5 km outside the city. The Azerbaijani army is trying to win back four villages that were seized by Armenians April 2-5. 90

of the civilian population of Fizuli—about 20,000 people—has been evacuated.

Baku predicts that the deterioration of circumstances in the Kubatly, Zangelan, Dzhebrail, and Fizuli regions of Azerbaijan, which are home to about 215,000 people, will give way to a new wave of refugees. Already over 250,000 have fled the fighting zone, moving to Azerbaijan's inner regions.

Armenian Forces Attacking Fizuli

NC0604125493 Baku AZERTAC in English 0518 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 5 (AZERTAC)—Divisions of the Armenian Expeditionary Corps, stationed in Upper Karabakh, having captured the village of Govshatly and the dominant hill of Mergen-ata, came nearer to the regional center of Fizuli as a result of large-scale offensive. According to the information centre of the Azeri Defence Ministry, in the morning the town was shelled with missiles from the side of positions, captured by the enemy, fights were going on at the distance of 2 kilometres from it. There are considerable destructions and 20 local inhabitants were killed in the very regional center.

According to the military department, the chief command of armed forces is taking extraordinary measures to save more than 15 thousand inhabitants of Kelbadzharskiy and Lachinskiy area, remaining in encirclement, as well as to transfer products and medicaments to mountain villages of the blockaded area.

Fizuli Attacks Repulsed

NC0604131893 Baku TURAN in English 1124 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, 6 April (TURAN)—According to information of the Ministry of Defence of Azerbaijan, this night attacks of the Armenian sub-units on the regional centre of Fizuli were beaten off. The enemy had losses and had to retreat. Sub-units of the Azeri national Army took poistions of strategically important hights of Mingelenata, Murguza and Uchtapa. The village of Govshadli of the region of Fizulinsky was recaptured.

The situation remains critical in the region of Kelbadzharskiy. But in the result of military activities Azeri Army stopped the enemy by the pass of Murov-dag.

Settlements of the region of Kubatlinskiy was shelled from the territory of the region of Gorisskiy of Armenia by 'Grad' instalation. There are destructions.

Armenian sub-units violated the state frontier to this morning and invaded the territory of Kubatlinskiy region. Battles go on there.

Kelbadzhar Area Situation Still 'Complex'

OW0604201193 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1926 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Azerbaijan reports that the situation in the Kelbadzharsky district of Azerbaijan remains complex. Fighting goes on around Murovdag pass, through which runs the road which links Kelbadzharsky to Khanlarsky district of the republic. Control of the heights around the pass shall enable the Armenian forces to shell the cities of Gyandzha and Khanlar.

The Ministry of Defense of Azerbaijan has information that by midday on April, 6 the Armenian offensive on the Kubatlinsky district had been stopped by the village of Faradzhan. The Armenian side is reported to have suffered losses of 11 dead and 15 wounded while Azerbaijani casualties include a dead soldier and 5 wounded.

On Tuesday the town of Fizuli and the surrounding villages had been shelled by the Armenian forces from "Grad" artillery, that simultaneously concentrated forces in areas vulnerable to tank offensives, that is to the West and North of Fizuli, as well near Martuni.

It is reported that settlements of the Kubatlinsky district of Azerbaijan have been heavily bombarded with missiles and artillery from the territory of the Gorissky district of Armenia. Primary information suggests substantial damages in the settlements in the border area with Armenia.

Parliament Holds Closed Session on Situation

NC0604131493 Baku AZERTAC in English 1225 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 6, (AZERTAC)—Deterioration of situation at the front, entailed a number of defeats of the Azeri national army, seizure of Kelbadzharskiy district centre by the Armenian armed forces had been discussed at a session of the Azeri parliament today. The session is going on behind the closed doors under the chairmanship of First Vice-Chairman of the Supreme Council Tamerlan Karayev. Speaker of the Parliament Isa Kamberov is in the zone of military operations.

Foreign Minister Said To Cancel Geneva Cease-Fire Talks

NC0604125093 Paris AFP in English 1212 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Geneva, April 6 (AFP) - Azerbaijan has called off informal ceasefire talks here on the war in Nagorno-Karabakh, demanding that Armenian troops first withdraw from Azerbaijan, a member of the Baku delegation said Tuesday.

Tofik Gasymov, Azerbaijan's foreign minister, broke off the talks late Monday, said aide Azimov Araz.

The talks, sponsored by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), had begun secretly here on Friday.

Gasymov, in a letter to the CSCE leadership, said Azerbaijan would not resume negotiations on ending the war over Nagorno-Karabkh until all Armenian troops are out of Azerbaijan.

Armenian forces over the weekend captured the strategic Kelbadzhar region between Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh, an Armenian majority enclave seeking independence from Azerbaijan.

Armenia denies that its troops are involved in the conflict, saying the fighting concerns only Armenian inhabitants of Nagorno- Karabakh.

Baku Reports Situation in Fizuli 'Improved'

NC0604154193 Baku Radio Baku Network in Azeri 1900 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Text] Osman Goknar, deputy head of the Fizulinskiy Rayon Executive Authority, has informed an AZERTAC correspondent by telephone that the situation in Fizuli has improved. Armenian units came within 2 km but measures were effected to repel them. Nine Armenian troops and six tanks were destroyed in the past three days. Isa Kamberov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, and State Adviser Arif Gadzhiyev have arrived in Fizuli.

Minister Says Country May Seek Military Help Abroad

NC0604174993 London Kanal-6 Television in Turkish 1630 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] The Azerbaijani Defense Ministry has announced that the Armenians have intensified their offensive towards the south. The ministry said that after Azerbaijani units repulsed the Armenian attacks on Fizulinskiy Rayon, the Armenians extensively shelled Kubatly with artillery. The Armenians then launched a land operation and advanced within 30 km of the city. The Armenian units, which were repulsed from Fizuli yesterday, have now taken positions 5 km outside the city.

Meanwhile, Khikmet Gadzhizade, Azerbaijani permanent representative in Moscow and deputy prime minister, said that his country may obtain military assistance from abroad.

By saying during his news conference in Moscow that relations between Azerbaijan and Iran are excellent, Gadzhizade implied that Iran might be the source of the military assistance.

Gadzhizade also said Azerbaijan is certain that Russian units participated in the Armenian attacks.

Baku Asks Iran To Help Evacuate Civilians

LD0604210393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 2022 GMT 6 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Oleg Kuzmin]

[Text] Tehran April 6 TASS—Azerbaijan called on Iran today to render assistance in the evacuation of civilians from regions encircled by the Armenian troops.

In a telephone conversation of Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati and his Azeri counterpart Vefa Gulizade, the latter thanked Tehran for its stand on recent Transcaucasian developments, the IRNA news agency reports.

Velayati confirmed Iran stands for unconditional withdrawal of Armenian units from the occupied Azeri territories. He stressed lasting peace in the region is possible to achieve only through negotiations and with the assistance of neighbouring states.

The Iranian minister received Azeri Ambassador to Iran Nasib Nasibzade, who called on Iran to render the republic emergency aid and praised the statement of the Iranian Foreign Ministry on escalation of combat operations in Nagorno-Karabakh. The statement denounced actions of the Armenian side, namely its capture of the Kelbadzhar town. Velayati expressed the readiness to expand aid to Azerbaijan on behalf of the Iranian leadership.

Army Launches Counteroffensive in Karabakh

LD0704123193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1125 GMT 7 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr—The Azerbaijani Army launched an offensive this morning against Martuninskiy Rayon of Nagorno-Karabakh. Sources in Stepanakert informed an ITAR-TASS correspondent by telephone that infantry, supported by nine tanks, had attacked Karabakh positions on the border with Azerbaijan's Fizulinskiy rayon. The attack was beaten off.

According to the same sources, the Armenian village of Tug in Gadrutskiy rayon of Nagorno-Karabakh was also subjected to rocket fire from Grad launchers. The number of casualties is being established.

Officials in Stepanakert denied reports that the offensive by Karabakh self-defense detachments caused massive casualties among the civilian population of Kelbadzharskiy rayon. They said that the Azerbaijani authorities were informed through the International Red Cross that a corridor for the evacuation of civilians from the combat zone would be left open for two days. The evacuation has already been completed. Only a few elderly people who do not wish to leave their homes are left in the area. Thirty-five women, children, and elderly people, who did not want to risk the difficult journey, were taken to Stepanakert, where they are being looked after by the International Red Cross, the reports from Stepanakert said. According to the same sources, several dozen Azerbaijani POWs are in Stepanakert.

Georgia

Shevardnadze Views U.S. Statement on Abkhazia

LD0604164893 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1347 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] [No dateline as received] At a session of the Georgian parliament today, Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze acquainted deputies with a statement made by an official from the U.S. State Department at a briefing for journalists. The statement says that, during the meeting between the presidents of the United States and Russia, the presidents discussed in detail the issue of the situation in Georgia, where military units of the former Soviet Union stand accused of getting involved in the conflict on the side of Abkhazian separatists.

It was noted at the briefing that the United States leadership supports the idea of the territorial integrity of Georgia, and it was said that the whole of the civilized world is now faced with a real threat of localized conflicts developing into conflicts on a global scale. The fact that Russian armed units on Georgian territory are not helping in any way the speedy settlement of the conflict also arouses some concern. Therefore, particular significance is being attached today to the steps that Boris Yeltsin will take next.

Shevardnadze Evaluates Russia-U.S. Summit

LD0504192993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1822 GMT 5 Apr 93

[By Georgian news agency correspondent Yuriy Goldman for TASS]

[Text] Tbilisi April 5 TASS—Georgian leader Eduard Shevardnadze, in the traditional Monday [5 April] radio interview, described the meeting between Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin as "an event of world scope".

These talks are of immense importance not only to Russia but also Europe and the entire world, he said. This meeting "was also preceded by my contacts with the U.S. Administraiton but not in order to ask about something and reduce pressure by reactionary forces existing in Russia on the Caucasus and specifically Georgia."

On the Georgian-Abkhazian conflict, Shevardnadze said the Sochi talks will be of major importance to its settlement if an agreement is reached to withdraw Russian troops from the conflict-torn area. According to Shevardnadze, "they now serve the goals of aggravation and destabilisation."

At the same time, it is natural that "my meeting with President Yeltsin should be instrumental to a final settlement of the conflict." He said this meeting "will take place by all means."

Parliament Defeats Bill Demanding Russian Army Withdrawal

LD0604095393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0851 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 6 Apr—The Georgian Parliament today voted down a draft resolution proposed by a number of parties demanding the withdrawal of the Russian Army from Abkhazia. Chairmnan of Parliament Eduard Shevardnadze, in his speech, called on the deputies to assess the situation realistically. In his opinion, the resolution would be taken by the Russian side as an ultimatum, and it would effectively torpedo the Georgian-Russian talks on a settlement of inter-state relations.

In this connection, the Georgian Parliament has given a mandate of confidence to a delegation for holding talks with Russia, which are to start at 1600 hours in Sochi today. The Georgian side intends to propose the discussion of three questions at them: withdrawal of Russian troops from Abkhazia; the status and schedule of the stationing of the Russian Force on the territory of Georgia; and the conclusion of a commercial-economic agreement with Russia.

Abkhazia Ready for Peace if Georgians Withdrawal

OW0404140493 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1253 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Speaker of Abkhazia's Parliament, Vladislav Ardzinba, has said Abkhazia is ready for a peaceful and civilized solution to the problem of its relations with Georgia, on condition that the Georgian side renounce its position of strength and withdraw its troops from Abkhazia.

On Sunday [4 April] he addressed "all nationalities and the people of good will" over the radio station "Voice of Abkhazia," urging them to give fraternal aid to tiny Abkhazia.

"The civilized world community must not watch with indifference how criminal-minded cut-throats are killing a whole nation," said Ardzinba. "We hope that international organisations, such as the UN, the CSCE and others, designed to protect human rights and uphold equality between nations, big and small, will strictly follow the spirit and the letter of their charters." According to Ardzinba, the real aims of the Tbilisi "regime" are to annihilate the Abkhazian people and evict all non-Georgians from Abkhazia. "We are not fighting against the Georgian people, who were entangled into this war by those who are obsessed with the wild idea of multinational Georgia and infected by the bacilli of extreme nationalism," the Abkhazian leader stressed.

Ardzinba thanked the peoples of the North Caucasus, the former Soviet republics for their aid to Abkhazia. According to him, this aid "is quite comparable with the international aid that was granted to Spain when it was subjected to the fascist aggression" in the 1930's.

Estonia

Meri Views Russian Troop Pullout, Vancouver Summit

OW0604211493 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1914 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] By announcing the suspension of troop withdrawals from Estonia and Latvia, President Yeltsin has thereby gone back on his promises, marking a turnabout in Russia's foreign policy, Estonian President Lennart Meri said commenting on the Vancouver summit at a news conference in Tallinn on Tuesday [6 April].

Lennart expressed his disappointment that president Clinton had failed to respond to Yeltsin's suprise statement.

He welcomed the news about the US offer of aid to Russia but regretted that the administration could find no opportunity of offering aid to other republics of the former Soviet Union.

Lennart said the resources allocated for the constuction of housing for Russian servicemen must first of all be used to help towards Russia's pull-out from Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

He denied Yeltsin's charges of human rights violations in his country saying that none of the visiting interntional commissions had found any, even if small, indication of discriminatory practices against other ethnic groups in Estonia.

"We have nothing to be ashamed of, our legislation can serve as an example to the rest of the world," Lennart said.

He also spoke of being ready to meet Boris Yeltsin "even at 5 p.m. today." However, the Estonian leader stressed the need for clearing the ground for such a meeting, saying it must not be a meeting for its own sake.

Denies Rights Violations

LD0604231593 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Report by Urmas Voit on a 6 April news conference by Estonian President Lennart Meri; passages within quotation marks are recorded]

[Text] [passage indistinct] [Voit] President Lennart Meri regretted that his warnings concerning a change of mind in Russian policy—which he mentioned in his speech on the republic's anniversary day—have become a reality. Russia is retreating from previous standpoints.

Concerning the Vancouver meeting, President Meri said:

[Meri] "I welcome the U.S. aid to Russia. Russian democracy and the exhausted Russian people need the utmost help, and I hope that the U.S. Government and the Clinton administration will be able to assist Russia in the future with more than $6 per person."

[Voit] Meri mentioned as a good sign the promise by Bill Clinton that a part of the money given for assisting Russia will be used for building housing for officers in Russia. It is up to Estonian foreign policy now to act at lightning speed so that as many soldiers as possible leaving Estonia will get into the houses to be built.

[Meri] "The assertions regarding a suppression of the rights of the Russian-speaking population in Estonia are unfounded. Not a single delegation that has visited Estonia and Latvia has, to the slightest extent, found anything of the kind. It caused me serious disappointment that, after that completely unexpected or—the other way around—not very expected remark by President Yeltsin, no sort of a reversing intercession came from President Clinton."

[Voit] The president scolded journalists that Yeltsin's statement concerning suspension of the withdrawal of the troops has not been published in the press.

[Meri] "Gentlemen and ladies, I ask you to fulfill your obligations toward your readers, even when this reduces the number of subscribers to your papers. I understand that it is profitable to print naked girls in the newspaper and that it is not very profitable to print such statements. I wanted to read this in the morning's papers."

[Voit] In leafing through today's RAHVA HAAL, PAEVALEHT, and HOMMIKULEHT—and also on the basis of yesterday's news broadcasts of the Estonian Radio—it is possible, however, to say that the accusation of the president was, to some extent, unjust.

Summit With Russia To Be Proposed at Talks

OW0304004193 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1711 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "At the next round of talks with Russia this country intends to suggest holding a summit meeting," Minister Juri Luik, head of the Estonian delegation, told BALTFAX.

"The negotiation process which has stalled lately needs an essentially different approach. A meeting of prime ministers or presidents of the two countries may signify a breakthrough," he said. The minister suggested holding such a meeting in Moscow or Tallinn at the end of April.

Luik said that an Estonian-Russian agreement on mutual granting of most preferred trading status and some other documents in the "economic basket" are practically finalized and can be signed in Nakhabino.

In his view, it is negotiations on military and border matters that give grounds for concern. Luik said that in Nakhabino the Estonian delegation wants to know the official Russian view on Russian Defense Minister Pavel

Grachev's statement on halting the withdrawal of Russian troops from the three Baltic states. He highly appreciated the support numerous western countries expressed for the Estonian delegation at the session of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council in Brussels.

Luik regretted lack of proper contacts between military agencies of the two countries and called for holding a meeting of their defense ministers. He said that in Estonia preparations are underway for such a meeting.

Russian Delegate 'Threatened' To End Talks

WS0504115393 Tallinn ETA NEWS RELEASE in English 1809 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Text] Tallinn, April 2—Head of the Russian delegation Vasiliy Svirin threatened to end the negotiations concerning the Estonian-Russian border, Minister Juri Luik, head of the Estonian delegation, announced today. "The Russian side considers the negotiations unnecessary while we maintain that they must be continued," Luik said. The negotiations concern Estonian territories annexed to the Russian Federation after World War II. Estonia is reclaiming the territories according to the peace treaty with Russia in 1920.

Russian Delegate Gives Data on Number of Servicemen

OW0304003793 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1712 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] As of March 1, 7,600 Russian servicemen still remain in Estonia. Vasiliy Svirin, leader of the Russian delegation at the inter-state negotiations with Estonia, handed over the data about the strength of soldiers and officers and the number of military detachments stationed in Estonia to the Estonian authorities during his visit to Tallinn early this week.

"It is for the first time that the Russian party has presented official information about the strength of its servicemen remaining in Estonia," said the leader of the Estonian delegation at the negotiations Minister Juri Luik, addressing the "round table" of the Estonian political parties on Friday [2 April]. According to Luik, now the Estonian experts are verifying the correctness of this information.

Prime Minister on Future Uses of Paldiski Naval Base

OW0504181693 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1645 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Once the Russian navy base in Paldiski is evacuated, Estonia will not close the port or turn it into its own navy facility. In all probability it will become a transit port for East-West trade, Mart Laar, Estonian prime minister, told parliament Monday [5 April].

He said that much interest is shown by western companies in that port and the cabinet is considering various options of its further use. He reported that an agreement had been reached with Russia that this closed town will be policed by Estonian law enforcement agencies and special controls will remain in place until the nuclear reactors are evacuated.

Laar was satisfied by the Russian consent to participation of IAEA [International Atomic Energy Agency] engineers in dismantling the reactors. He said that team of Russian experts has completed its work in Paldiski recently. The team is supposed to report its findings at the next round of Estonian-Russian talks to be held in Nakhabino near Moscow April 6-7.

Retired U.S. Colonel Seeking Command of Estonian Army

OW0604120593 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1031 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Lennart Meri of Estonia has asked U.S. President Bill Clinton to allow the American retired colonel Alexander Einseln, born in Estonia, to take over its armed forces.

The newspaper POSOTIMEES reports that Mr. Meri sent the same request to the Bush administration, however, the matter remained unsettled because of the cabinet's change at the time.

Colonel Einseln voiced hope in a telephone interview that the issue might be resolved within the next two weeks.

The U.S. Army veteran is 61 years old. In 1944, he fled to Germany with his mother and then moved to the United States. After fighting in the Korean and Vietnam wars, he served in the U.S. Infantry Headquarters and in the U.S. Chiefs of Staff Committee. He retired in 1985 and now works for an American firm in the United States.

Agreement Reached With Latvia on Border Changes

WS0504115593 Tallinn BNS in English 1216 GMT 3 Apr 93

[Text] Tallinn, Apr 02, BNS—Estonia and Latvia agreed on minor changes in the common borderline. The changes won't affect the total length of the border, said Udo Helme, the head of the Estonian delegation in the bilateral border commission.

Helme told BNS that the changes will make the natural border in some places "a geometrical one". The commission ruled to cut a corner of the border even near Voru in southeast Estonia, giving Latvia 26 hectares of land that formerly was Estonian territory. The border was "straightened" also in the Valga region near in mid-section of the border.

"Changes in the borderline have been made so far on Latvia's account, that is, toward the south. Therefore Estonia has sustained no losses in the final account," Helme added.

Under an agreement signed between the two countries, Estonia must build up the 157-kilometer eastern part of the border, and Latvia, the border to the west of a negotiated point eight kilometers north of Valga.

Mats, an Estonian building company based in Marjamaa, won the competitive bidding for making the heads of the border posts for both countries. Latvia, in turn, will supply the coats of arms for the border signs of both countries.

Estonia in this year's state budget allocated 1.9 million kroons for building up the border section.

Lithuania

Gylys Notes Support for Stabilization in Russia

OW0504175593 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1644 GMT 5 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuania is supportive of international efforts to stabilize the Russian situation, Povilas Gylys, Lithuanian Foreign Minster, said at a briefing Monday [5 April] when Baltfax asked him to comment on the Vancouver summit of Presidents Boris Yeltsin and Bill Clinton.

Gylys also emphasized that Lithuania intended to "sit again at a negotiating table with Russia" (the latest meeting of state delegations of the two countries was held last September - BF [BALTFAX]). The minister said that a new Lithuanian delegation was laying the groundwork for new meetings.

Commenting on the demand, made by Vytautas Landsbergis, the opposition leader, that pressure be applied to have Russian troops withdrawn from Lithuania and arrangements be made for sending "blue helmets" into Lithuania if the Russian situation deteriorates, the minister expressed his doubt that such pressure was needed. In his view, such steps will only "contribute to increasing the psychological and political tension in the region" and "provoke the most radical forces in the neighboring countries." In briefing journalists on his visit to Strasbourg last week, where he met with top officials of the Council of Europe, Gylys said that western statesmen welcomed the firm but moderate position of Lithuania which, the minister said, "does not provoke anybody or increase regional tension." Gylys also said that an accord with Germany has been nearly finalized and that only the date for its signing remains to be agreed to. This, he said, must be settled within a month.

Brazauskas Receives Message From Russia's Kozyrev

LD0604183193 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 93

[Text] Lithuanian President Brazauskas has received a letter from Russian Foreign Minister Kozyrev expressing thanks for the cordial reception afforded him during his visit to Lithuania. Kozyrev stressed that the discussion about current Lithuanian-Russian relations was meaningful and useful to both sides.

The Russian foreign minister stressed in his letter that through visiting Vilnius, he became convinced once again that it will be possible by joint efforts to raise Lithuanian-Russian relations to a qualitatively new level, and develop them on the basis of good-neighborliness, equality, and useful cooperation.

The Russian foreign minister also noted that it is especially important to renew interstate negotiations and work in a productive manner in drafting agreements on concrete issues.

Prime Minister Discusses Program at Seimas

LD0604185793

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian at 1205 GMT on 6 April carries a 85-minute live relay from the Lithuanian Seimas. At about 1210 GMT, Prime Minister Adolfas Slezevicius takes the floor to address the Seimas. Speaking about the recent increase of prices for food products, the prime minister says: "The growth of food prices is primarily decided by the purchase prices of agricultural produce, primarily milk and meat. Currently, the significant decrease in the purchase rate of meat products indicates that the real resources are decreasing and that agriculture is in an especially difficult situation. During the first quarter of this year, the amount of milk purchased comprised only 73 percent of last year's total at the same time, and the purchase of animals and poultry are only 58 percent of the same period last year."

The prime minister says that "the current dialogue between agriculture workers and processing workers has become very tense, and as a result of this, purchase prices for all the main cattle breeding produce have already become higher than the world prices for the same products."

Speaking about the cabinet's decision to allow the import of meat into Lithuania, Slezevicius says: "The republic is in an unprecedented situation where the government has to make a decision to allow the import of bacon into Lithuania. This has never happened in the entire history of Lithuania. This would be a measure in order to supply the market with meat products and, on the other hand, this would be a response to normalize a realistic purchase price level. We think that only by economic methods can we influence the processes taking place in this sphere."

Following this, the prime minister spoke about the available credits for agriculture this year, which would ensure the spring sowing this year.

Speaking about the rising food prices, the prime minister says, "Although the purchase prices are rising rather fast for various reasons, the government sees no alternative to the liberalization of prices. We do not have any choice because any measures, any attempts on our part to control the prices by the method of decree, would not do us any good."

The prime minister continued: "We also have on our agenda unpopular, but in our view, essential measures. This is the removal of subsidies for two kinds of bread. This measure costs us 100 million coupons each month, and essentially all the reserves for the subsidy have been exhausted. Moreover, very negative phenomena exist here. Due to the four or fivefold difference in prices, substantial resources are being taken to neighboring countries. Latvia has been compelled to adopt measures, beginning 1 April, to ban imports. They did not see any other way of normalizing our relations. This was stated yesterday by the Latvian ambassador, Mr. Sarkanis."

Speaking of the heating problem, Slezevicius said that a compensation mechanism will have to be created in order to compensate residents in their payments for communal services. The present differences in wages in various industry branches has a negative influence on the general situation of the economy, and the government will shortly submit to the Seimas corresponding proposals. He continued: "The settlement of accounts has completely paralyzed the economy. The bank is taking measures to introduce order in this sphere. The situation is essentially improving, although not at the desired rate." Slezevicius described some known agreements reached earlier with Russian Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and the Lentransgaz.

Speaking of questions put to him by opposition leader Landsbergis, he stated: "There are two questions. Has Lithuania sent a telegram to Moscow saying it agrees to become an associated member of the Surgut agreement? If it has sent such telegram, who signed it and with what plenipotentiary powers? I must state officially, since the question was addressed to me, that there have been no telegrams or correspondence on the participation of our representatives in the Moscow meeting. There has been no official invitation by Moscow organizations to take part in such meeting. The second question is: At the second stage of the Surgut agreement there was a Lithuanian flag on the table of the meeting; was a Lithuanian representative present there? If so, who and with what plenipotentiary powers? If he did not take part, who gave permission to use the Lithuanian flag? From the reply to the first question, it is clear that there was no representative, nobody had any authorization, and, it seems, this topic has been exhausted since we, the members of the government, have explained more than once that the participation as an observer by Mr. Sinevicius was lawful. Our further actions and efforts are aimed at ensuring our normal economic cooperation on the basis of bilateral agreement. I have informed you about this, but what results will be achieved during the negotiations, I will be able to inform you about during our next encounter."

Slezevicius then replied to questions by Seimas members.

Army Officers Establish Assembly

OW0404164293 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1527 GMT 4 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In Lithuania, army officers set up an assembly on 2 April. Attending the assembly's opening congress were president Algirdas Brazauskas, the chairman of the parliamentary national security committee Gediminas Kirkilas, the leader of the right-wing opposition in Seimas Vytautas Landsbergis, and the defence minister Audrius Butkevicius.

Addressing the audience, Mr. Brazauskas noted that the situation in Lithuania's defense structures mirrored the overall economic recession. At the same time, he voiced hope that the economic problems would not affect the discipline and order in the army.

Participants in the forum discussed a national security concept, a state military doctrine, conscription, army service and mobilization, officers training, and national borders guarantee.

The assembly elected its steering bodies.

Brazauskas Attends Meeting Commemorating Trade Unions

LD0304103093 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1400 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Excerpts] The day of trade union actions is commemorated today in Europe. Trade unions throughout the continent are organizing meetings and demonstrations, and petitions are being handed in to the employers. This day is being marked with various actions in Lithuania too.

Representatives of all Lithuanian trade union centers assembled in the Palace of the Trade Union Communities and discussed matters concerning many people in Lithuania. It was noted at the beginning of the meeting that today's actions do not constitute a protest against the government, parties, or persons. [passage omitted]

The heads of the trade unions stated that they are not against economic reform but against economic experiments harming society. Yesterday's increase in the prices of the most essential goods was termed a monopolist economic subversion.

The participants in the meeting were visited by Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas. He reviewed the history of the Lithuanian trade unions and compared it with the present time. The head of state said he is glad at the flourishing of the trade unions, but he believes that the present 56 trade union branches are too many for small Lithuania. Therefore, it is difficult for the state leaders to listen to all of them and help them. In the view of the president, the trade unions should pay more attention to prices, defending the interests of the consumers, and the affairs of income and work. He supports noninterference by the trade unions into political life.

The president agreed that state registration should not be applied to trade unions. The president noted that, together with the prime minister, he will identify those responsible for the price increases and invited the trade unions to help to draw up laws essential for society. In assessing the present economic decline, the president cited objective reasons, but also stressed subjective factors, in particular the self-will of the leaders. We do not need blood, but justice and well-considered management, the president said. The head of state urged the trade unions to continue the constant and fruitful dialogue both with the government and with him.

Further Brazauskas Remarks

OW0204211293 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1920 GMT 2 Apr 93

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Lithuanian President Algirdas Brazauskas addressed Friday [2 April] a conference of representatives of all the main trade union organizations of the republic, pointing to the need for a dialogue between the unions, the government and other power structures. The Lithuanian trade unions ought to be more actively involved in drafting laws, settling wage-related problems, as well as in the issues related to labor conditions, use of labor resources, pensions, etc, he said.

Mr Brazauskas had to admit that "in the recent years the Lithuanian trade unions were seriously damaged," since, in his words, the preceding government adopted a series of unconstitutional laws depriving the unions of most of their property, infringing on their rights and playing down their import as social organizations.

The president assured the conference that all of the previous mistakes will be corrected and the trade unions will not have to undergo a registration procedure, as was practiced in Lithuania until now.

The Trade union conference stands out as an important step undertaken in the republic to mark the Day of People's Rights and Social Interests.

Landsbergis Marks Anniversary of Independence

WS0504130093 Vilnius LIETUVOS AIDAS in Lithuanian 12 Mar 93 No. 47 p 5

[Speech by opposition leader Vytautas Landsbergis, at a meeting on 11 March commemorating the third anniversary of the restoration of Lithuania's independence: "We Are Different"; under the "Opinions" rubric]

[Text] The decisions that were adopted in this hall three years ago so swiftly changed people's lives and the course of events in Lithuania, the former Soviet Union, and maybe in the entire world.

Our former life was ripe for change; it was like a spring bush that is ready to burst into blossom. The first bud and twig had to appear somewhere, and this happened in Lithuania. Many of us took part in this process.

We were different, but actually we formed two groups of people and politicians—those who are ready to adopt decisions and those who prefer to wait. There were those who are practical and pragmatic and those who observe legal principles. If someone wishes to put this in philosophical terms, we should most probably speak about materialists and idealists. The assessment of the situation must have depended on such a division: Was it a historical chance and duty which we had to fulfill immediately by announcing the restoration of Lithuania's independence on 11 March 1990, or was it a lack of such a feeling of responsibility and the speculations about the benefit?

If we had postponed our decision, we would have remained unchanged. But we did not put it off and we became different.

Even those who joined the decision of the majority but who were not sure whether they did right and made this move because they felt moral pressure and wanted to behave well, even those participants of this historical moment were compelled to change then or a bit later, and I hope, for the better.

Since then, not Moscow but Vilnius has again become the center of Lithuania's developments. I say "again" because the same thing happened in 1918. On 11 March we repeatedly confirmed the 16 February Independence Act. The "Act on the Restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania" says: Lithuania is again an independent state.

Again and again.

It is good that there were some Russians, one Jew, and several Poles among us. This was not ethnic but civil and moral self-determination. We stated who we are, what we want to be, and what we are worth. Are we normal people, according to Vydunas [Lithuanian writer and philosopher], or are we some Soviet human beings who prefer to listen to Moscow's instructions?

This question was hanging in the air. It was knocking on our souls and hearts like the grass that is shooting through five-decades-old thick asphalt. We replied to this question with dignity. We may have imperceptibly brought back the idea of honor into politics.

We had to rack our brains a lot over some more difficult legal moments, because the deputies who were elected to the Supreme Council of the Lithuanian SSR had to become different in a reasonable way. To this end, we adopted a declaration on the authorities of the Lithuanian SSR deputies which explained that we were only making use of foreign state structures thrust on us. However, these structures already expressed our people's sovereign will, as, for example, "this Supreme Council" which "from 1800 on 11 March 1990 will be called the Lithuanian Supreme Council." This is how the Lithuanian SSR disappeared. The new council immediately adopted the "Law on the State Name and Emblem" and decided to use the state name "the Republic of Lithuania" or "Lithuania" and to call itself only the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania.

After this law had been adopted, the tricolor was raised on the wall, burying the Lithuanian SSR emblem. I do not doubt that most of Lithuania's people who were watching the ceremony on the screen did not regret this.

It is only at 1830 or 1840 that we began to debate the "Act on the Restoration of the Independent State of Lithuania."

Certainly, this was not a five-minute vote at night, as President M. Gorbachev would later say to Western politicians and journalists. It was the fruit of long and careful work. We had to remind people about it. That is why we gradually eliminated the concept of the Lithuanian SSR from our legal acts. The work had to be clean and precise, and we adopted and signed the Independence Act by the only name of the Republic of Lithuania.

This was not an unconstitutional action because we confirmed with ensuing constitutional decisions the will declared in the act that "no foreign constitution is valid" in Lithuania. The last of them—the provisional constitution—was adopted in the late evening of 11 March. All subsequent Soviet demands to acknowledge the validity of the USSR constitution in Lithuania, even the 10 January 1991 ultimatum which was followed by violence and bloodshed, was an involuntary recognition that Lithuania is really different and sovereign. The USSR demanded that our country accept the Soviet constitution and system anew—the things that no longer existed in Lithuania. I wish Lithuania's de facto recognition had not been so brutal—through blockade and massacre. Such, however, was the Soviet custom.

We were different like Lithuania itself. We were both unanimous and dissimilar, angry, and full of spite. On the other hand, we were able to laugh, even at ourselves. This may have reflected not only the complicated spiritual legacy, but also the youthful spirit of the reviving country.

The former Supreme Council must have been younger than the current Seimas. The most important thing that this resistance and internal strife have revealed is this: When resisting external threat or aggression we manage to show the good qualities that strengthen our country, but when fighting among ourselves for power we reveal the bad features that weaken Lithuania. Let us hope that Professor B. Genzelis' warning will not come true: "Regaining of power for some people is an end in itself and a means to enrich themselves."

Clouds are gathering in the east again, and I doubt whether anyone can bring the sun from there. A threat to Russia's democracy is a threat to Lithuania's freedom. At present Russia is calling us by strange names, as, for example, its special "close foreign countries" instead of foreign states. Moscow is declaring its specific interests and ostensibly eternal "rights" to strive for the Baltic Sea. Far from being an example of peacefulness or stability, that country has declared its intention to spread "peace and stability" by force. It has even adopted a law on privileges to its officers for taking part in armed conflicts in the Baltic countries. Such things are almost unknown in state relations. Thus, we should not keep silent. I hope that the Seimas will adopt the statement "On Russia's Intentions To Interfere in Lithuania's Affairs" which the opposition proposed yesterday. This would provide evidence of our unity in the face of danger that we managed to achieve after 11 March. We would demonstrate a possible formation of our national policy, primarily in the sphere of state security. The lack of unity in this issue would be a very negative phenomenon. It is unwise to strain our interrelations over such internal issues as the withdrawal of some deputies' mandates, the disregard of land restoration for farmers, the restriction of the opposition's freedom to express its views on television, the prejudice against independent television studios and channels, and the avoidance of truly establishing a genocide research center.

There is plenty of reserve to ease our internal confrontation, to look for ways of cooperation, and to devote all our efforts to the state work. May this anniversary prompt us to consider extending good will: Is it not too great a luxury not to see what is happening at our neighbors' place, as if we are alone in the world with our own scores?

We are different but we should manage to turn these differences into an asset that can enrich us, not into a negation and destruction, because we are living and will live in this sole country which is again independent after 11 March. We may lose our health or heads, but we must preserve Lithuania.